COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

SEVENTH REPORT

Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation
'Proposals to amend Guidelines
on MPLADS'

Presented to Lok Sabha on : 31.08.2001

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

August , 2001/Bhadrapada , 1923(S)

CONTENTS

PAGE

Composition of MPLADS Committee……. (iv)

Introduction……. (vi)

REPORT

I.	**Permission to purchase mobile buses/vans under MPLADS…**	**1**
II.	**Suggestion regarding construction of a Memorial Community Hall under MPLADS……**	**3**
III.	**Provision for administrative expenses under MPLADS…….**	**5**
IV.	**Suggestion regarding purchase of Hearse Van from MPLADS Funds……..**	**8**
V.	**Suggestion regarding relaxation of upper limit of Rs.25 lakhs For individual works for construction of cultural centres under MPLADS……**	**10**
VI.	**Suggestion regarding review of functioning of MPLAD Scheme.**	**12**
VII.	**Suggestion regarding use of MPLADS funds for purchase of a Bus for Government Girls Degree College in Udhampur Parliamentary constituency in Jammu and Kashmir……**	**13**
VIII.	**Suggestion regarding construction of Foot Over Bridge across The River Salandi in Orissa under MPLADS…….**	**15**
IX.	**Suggestion regarding purchase of Mobile Dental Van from MPLADS funds…….**	**17**
X.	**Suggestion regarding funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds…….**	**18**
XI.	**Suggestion regarding appointing of executive agency by Member of Parliament for works recommended under MPLADS…….**	**20**

XII.	**Suggestion regarding purchase of completed/incomplete Buildings under MPLADS…….**	**23**
XIII.	**Seeking permission to contribute Rs. 100 crore from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families in Churachandpur District, in Manipur……**	**25**
XIV.	**Request regarding relaxation of the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs for projects under MPLADS by Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad, MP (RS)……**	**27**
XV.	**Representation regarding permission to construct individual Houses in the earthquake affected Dholaveera village in Gujarat under MPLADS…….**	**29**
XVI.	**Amendment in formats placed at Appendix-3 and Appendix-4 of the Guidelines on MPLADS……**	**32**
XVII.	**Representation regarding purchase of digitization equipment Under MPLADS for Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samastha (SGS) run by a registered body……..**	**35**
XVIII.	**Representation regarding change of Nodal District Collector In respect of nominated MPs of Rajya Sabha……..**	**37**
XIX	**Suggestion regarding inclusion of purchase of Rotating Sprinklers under MPLADS……..**	**39**
XX.	**Representation regarding utilisation of MPLADS funds for Special forestry projects……..**	**41**
XXI.	**Repair of irrigation canal under MPLADS……..**	**43**
XXII.	**Representation regarding inclusion of purchase of Aqua-Guard Coolers and Drinking Water Tankers under MPLADS…….**	**45**
XXIII.	**Suggestion regarding purchase of garbage collection Vehicle under MPLADS……**	**47**
XXIV.	**Proposal for removing the cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per Work under MPLADS……..**	**49**
XXV.	**Contribution for construction and procurement of equipment for a voluntary blood bank project in Delhi from MPLADS funds……..**	**51**

APPENDICES

I.	**Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS Held on 7.8.2001……**	**56**
II.	**Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 28.8.2001……..**	**61**
III.	**Statement of Observations/Recommendations.**	**66**

COMPOSITION OF THE MPLADS COMMITTEE

Dr. Bolla Bulli Ramaiah - Chairman

MEMBERS

2. **Shri Adhi Sankar**
3. **Shri Arun Kumar**
4. **Dr. Baliram**
5. **Shri G.M. Banatwalla**
6. **Shri Surendra Singh Barwala**
7. **Shri Satyavrat Chaturvedi**
8. **Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi**
9. **Shri Bikram Keshari Deo**
10. **Shri Raghuvir Singh Kaushal**
11. **Shri Chandrakant Khaire**
12. **Shri Sis Ram Ola**
13. **Prof. R.R. Pramanik**
14. **Shri C.P. Radhakrishnan**
15. **Shri Rajendrasinh Rana**
16. **Shri S.B.P.B.K. Satyanarayana Rao**
17. **Shri Tara Chand Sahu**
18. **Shri Saiduzzama**
19. **Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan**
20. **Shri Balbir Singh**
21. **Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh**
22. **Shri Chinmayanand Swami**
23. **Shri Ravi Prakash Verma**
24. **Shri Dinesh Chandra Yadav**

SECRETARIAT

1. **Dr.(Smt.) Paramjit Kaur Sandhu - Joint Secretary**
2. **Shri K.L. Narang - Director**
3. **Shri S.C.Kaliraman - Assistant Director**

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) (2001) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Seventh Report on the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation `Proposals to amend Guidelines on MPLADS.'

2. The Committee considered the representations and proposals received from Hon'ble Ministers and Members of Parliament for amendment to Guidelines on MPLAD Scheme at their sittings held on 7 and 28 August, 2001. The observations/recommendations made in the Report are based on the decisions taken by the Committee at their aforesaid sittings.

3. The Committee considered and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 30 August, 2001.

4. The Committee would like to express their thanks to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for placing before them the written notes and information the Committee desired in connection with the examination of the representations and suggestions of Hon'ble Members of Parliament for amendment to the Guidelines on MPLAD Scheme.

5. For facility of reference, the observations/recommendations of the Committee have been printed in bold letters in the body of the Report and have also been reproduced in consolidated form in the Appendix to the Report.

New Delhi
30 August, 2001
Bhadrapara 8, 1923(S)

Dr. BOLLA BULLI RAMAIAH
Chairman,
Committee on Members of Parliament
Local Area Development Scheme

REPORT

I

Permission to purchase mobile buses/vans under MPLADS

1.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 12 March, 2001 to Lok Sabha Secretariat enclosing therewith a copy of letter dated 2 March, 2001 from Shri Vijay Goel, MP (LS) addressed to hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS regarding seeking permission to purchase mobile buses/vans under MPLAD Scheme for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

1.2 In his letter, the hon'ble Member stated as follows:-

> "Chandni Chowk is a Heritage City of Delhi besides being a wholesale market. I represent Chandni Chowk Lok Sabha Constituency and the area is visited both by foreign and domestic tourists for seeing places like Red Fort, Jama Masjid, Sis-Ganj Gurudwara, Gouri Shankar Mandir etc. and for making purchases of all types of goods. You will agree and appreciate that the constituency truly represents the secular character of our nation.
>
> The roads and the markets in the area are always over crowded due to visitors and innumerable auto and cycle-rickshaws plying in the area and often the roads are jam-packed. The Traffic moves at snails pace which gives bad impression to the foreign tourists and creates problems for free movement of children and aged people.
>
> In order to streamline the traffic and remove the various bottlenecks in free movement of the people, I am interested to purchase four mobile buses/ vans like ones operated in the Pragati Maidan during the Trade Fair. The cost of these buses is to be financed out of my MPLAD Funds. Each such bus costs between Rs. 6 to 8 lakhs approximately.
>
> The running cost of these buses will be borne either through advertisements or under the over all charge of DTC/local trader's association/civics bodies or some NGOs. I am informed that this proposal is not feasible as per the existing guidelines for the purchase of these buses. In view of the secular character of the area and need for smooth flow of traffic, I will be extremely happy if you treat this as a special case in isolation and permit me to purchase four buses, which will ply free of cost for the people of the area."

1.3 In pursuant to the orders of the hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS, the matter was considered by the MPLADS Committee in their meeting held on 19 March, 2001 and the latter decided that the comments of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation might be obtained in regard to the implementation aspect before placing it before the Committee for further consideration.

1.4 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their response, vide their communication dated 11 April, 2001 stated as under :-

> "The Guidelines on MPLADS do not permit purchase of any type of vehicle other than ambulances for Government hospitals and reputed service organisations with certain conditions. The Guidelines allow works which are developmental in nature, which may lead to creation of durable assets. There is a specific restriction on incurring of revenue expenditure and procurement of inventory items or stock of any type. Hence, the proposal for the purchase of mobile buses/vans does not fit into the framework of the Guidelines on MPLADS."

Recommendation

1.5 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member for taking permission to purchase mobile buses/vans under MPLADS and disapprove it as it is against the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee are of the view that the purchase of mobile buses/vans under MPLADS might create problem of maintenance and recurring expenditure.

II

Suggestion regarding construction of a Memorial Community Hall under MPLADS

2.1 The Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 2 March, 2001 to the Secretary General, Lok Sabha enclosing therewith a copy of letter from Dr. Mahesh Chandra Sharma, MP (Rajya Sabha) dated 13 October, 2000 to Shri Arun Shourie, Minister of State for Planning, Statistics and Programme Implementation and Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances regarding construction of a Memorial Community Hall at Village Bhansal, Panchayat Samiti Mawli (District Udaipur, Rajasthan) under MPLADS.

2.2 In his letter dated 13 October, 2000 addressed to MOS (S&PI), the hon'ble Member stated as follows:-

> "I had vide my letter dated 16.9.2000 recommended the District Magistrate, Udaipur to sanction an amount of rupees three lakhs for construction of Pt. Deen Dayal Upadhyay Community Centre at Gram Panchayat Bhansole, Panchayat Samiti Mawali (district Udaipur) out of my MPLADS fund. It has been stated in the reply given by his office that the said work could not be approved under the guidelines of the scheme.
>
> To me this recommendation is as per the rule. Therefore, you are kindly requested to give necessary instructions to the District Magistrate, Udiapur to provide the amount sanctioned by me to the Panchayat Samiti for construction of Pt. Deen Dayal Upadhyay Community Centre."

2.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 2 March, 2001 stated as under:-

> "This Ministry has received a proposal from Dr. Mahesh Chandra Sharma, MP (Rajya Sabha) for construction of a community hall at Village Bhansol, Panchayat Samiti Mawli (District Udaipur, Rajasthan) at an estimated cost of Rs. three lakhs. He has stated that the District Collector, Udaipur has replied stating that the above work cannot be undertaken as per the guidelines on MPLADS. It may be mentioned that there is a specific restriction on construction of memorial/memorial buildings as per Item No.5 of Appendix 2 of the guidelines on MPLADS.
>
> In view of the above specific restriction on the construction of memorial/ memorial buildings, the matter may please be submitted to the Committees on MPLADS of Lok Sabha/Rajya Sabha and this Ministry may kindy be advised whether construction of community hall as mentioned above can be undertaken under the MPLADS."

Recommendation

2.4 The Committee after having considered the proposal of hon'ble Member (Rajya Sabha) regarding construction of a Memorial Community Hall under MPLADS, do not approve the same as there is a specific restriction on construction of memorials or memorial buildings as per Item No.5 of Appendix-2 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

III

Provision for administrative expenses under MPLADS

3.1 Dr. B.B. Ramaiah, Chairman, Committee on MPLADS faxed a communication dated 12 February, 2001 to the Lok Sabha Secretariat for making provision for administrative expenses under MPLADS and stated as follows:-

> "At every Review Meeting on the implementation of the works sanctioned under MPLADS with the Executive Agencies by the District Collector, West Godavari, Eluru, the following points were being raised:
>
> Petty Supervision Charges: For works sanctioned under MPLADS no petty supervision charges are allowed. However, as there has been no budget allocation for petty supervision charges in respect of these works, employees of some of the Executive Agencies are not getting salaries for months together.
>
> Administrative Expenses: MPLADS is being administered by Chief Planning Officers in the Districts under the supervision of District Collector. No separate budget allocation is being made by the Government for administrative expenses incurred by the Administration.
>
> District Collector also opines that P.S. Charges should be allowed to be included in the Estimates of Works sanctioned under MPLADS to meet the establishment charges of Executive Agencies and a certain percentage of funds released under MPLADS (say 1%) should be set apart towards administrative charges.
>
> These points may be considered at the meeting of the Committee on MPLADS."

3.2 In this connection, Para 3.5 of the Guidelines on MPLADS envisages as follows:-

> "Since the works under this scheme would be implemented by different State Government agencies such as PWD, Rural Development, Irrigation, Agriculture, Health, Education, Area Development Authorities, Water Supply and Sewerage Boards, Housing Corporation etc., the Heads of the respective districts would be responsible for the coordination and overall supervision of the works under this scheme at the district level. The implementing agencies may not collect any administrative charges, centage etc. for their services of preparatory work, implementation, supervision, etc."

3.3 Shri Ramesh Chennithala, MP (LS) also forwarded a similar proposal. The hon'ble Member in his letter dated 16 March, 2001, stated as follows:-

> "I am writing this letter in connection with the implementation and supervision of MPLAD Scheme in Pathanamthitta District, under my constituency in Kerala. In Kerala, the Nodal Officer for all the developmental projects is District Planning Officer. He assists District Collector for the implementation of

MPLAD Scheme. As a special case, Pathanamthitta District gets 50 percent of the funds earmarked for three MPs representing Idukki, Adoor and Mavelikkara. Besides this, the funds from Rajya Sabha Members are also utilised for the developmental projects. The State Government is providing only infrastructure facilities and not sanctioning any funds to meet the expenses incurred towards TA and OE for the proper and successful implementation of the developmental projects. It needs a huge amount for the proper maintaining of the Office Reports and Stationery and also a good number of official tours for the supervision of projects. Now, the Government is providing a small amount as TA and OE, it is not sufficient to meet the diesel charge and other expenses. Pathanamthitta District is getting around four crores of rupees every year for developmental projects. A copy of the letter from the District Collector, Pathanamthitta is enclosed herewith for your reference.

Hence, I request you to kindly consider the above and do the needful to sanction at least Rs.25,000/- every year as TA&OE for the implementation of MPLAD Scheme in Pathanamthitta District of Kerala."

3.4 The communication from hon'ble Chairman was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for obtaining factual comments thereon. The Ministry vide their reply dated 23 March, 2001 stated as under:-

Supervision charges for the executing agencies:

Para 3.5 of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulate that the implementing agencies may not collect any administrative charges, centage etc., for their services of preparatory work, implementation, supervision etc. The executing agencies, therefore, cannot include petty supervision charges in the estimates of the works.

Requests had been received in the past from some State Governments for allowing executing agencies to charge administrative/centage charges from MPLADS saying that these executing agencies have to run their establishment from the administrative charges. The Ministry had informed the States that the Central Government is spending huge amounts under the Scheme and the assets created with the funds from the Scheme ultimately become the property of the State Government and it is the people of the State who are benefited with these assets. When Central Government is spending so much funds for the purpose, it becomes the responsibility of the State Government also to contribute small amount to meet the administrative charges for implementation of the Scheme.

Administrative expenses:

A proposal was mooted by this Ministry to the Ministry of Finance for allowing, to begin with, contingent expenditure of Rs. 25,000 per year per MP to meet contingent expenditure by District authorities for implementing MPLADS. That Ministry did not agree to the proposal to allow Rs. 25,000 per year per MP as an additionality but suggested that the contingent expenditure could be earmarked out of MPLADS funds allocation of each MP. If the Committee recommends to allow to utilise

some amount by the District authorities out of the existing allocation of each MP per year, amendment in the Guidelines to incorporate this, may be considered."

Recommendation

3.5 The Committee note the proposal regarding making provision for administrative expenses under MPLADS. The Committee recommend that necessary amendment might be incorporated in the Guidelines on MPLADS to allow the district authorities to utilise half per cent amount as administrative expenses out of the existing allocation of each Member of Parliament per year under MPLADS.

IV

Suggestion regarding purchase of Hearse Van from MPLADS funds

*****

4.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 16 March, 2001 enclosing therewith a copy of letter from Dr. Ashok Kumar Walia, Minister of Health, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi, addressed to Shri Arun Shourie, Minister of State for Planning, Statistics and Programme Implementation on the above subject.

4.2 In his letter dated 16 February, 2001 the hon'ble Minister, Dr. Ashok Kumar Walia, stated as follows:-

> "A request has been received from Dr. Karan Singh, Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha) for release of Rs. 5 lakhs from MPLADS fund for purchase of one Hearse Van through the Directorate of Health Services, Government of Delhi.
>
> Government of Delhi had sought clearance of the Ministry for a Hearse Van to be purchased out of the MPLADS fund, keeping in view the felt need for the same. However, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation have vide letter No. R/30/4/2000-MPLADS dated 23.1.2001 informed that the purchase of any vehicle other than ambulance is not covered under the Guidelines and therefore a Hearse Van cannot be purchased out of funds under MPLADS.
>
> The matter needs to be examined and appreciated in the light of the fact that the purchase of ambulances and the construction of crematoria and structures on burial/cremation grounds are already being permitted. Logically, therefore, the purchase of a Hearse Van should perhaps not be viewed as a significant departure from the guidelines, as this is only an essential extension or adjunct to the aforesaid facilities already being provided for the community. Besides, it reflects a felt need and, therefore, calls for a relaxation of the guidelines, if this is necessary."

4.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 16 March, 2001 stated as under:-

> "In this connection, it is mentioned that the existing Guidelines on MPLADS permit procurement of Ambulances for the Government Hospitals and reputed service organizations like that of R.K. Mission, Red Cross, etc. Mobile dispensaries can be provided under the scheme in rural areas to Government and Panchayati Raj Institutions. Also hospital equipments can be purchased for Government hospitals. Hearse Van is not covered by these provisions. Therefore, the request of the hon'ble MP (RS) may kindly be placed before the Committee on MPLADS for its consideration."

Recommendation

4.4 After having considered the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding purchase of Hearse Van from MPLADS funds, the Committee decided to reject it as the purchase of Hearse Van is not covered by the provisions of the Guidelines on MPLADS. The existing Guidelines on MPLADS permit procurement of ambulances for the Government hospitals and reputed service organisations like Rama Krishna Mission, Red Cross society etc. but purchase of Hearse Van is not allowed under these Guidelines.

V

Suggestion regarding relaxation of upper limit of Rs. 25 lakhs for individual works for construction of cultural centres under MPLADS

5.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 8 March, 2001 to Lok Sabha Secretariat enclosing therewith a copy of letter dated 27 Janaury, 2001 from Shri Kartar Singh Duggal, MP (RS) addressed to Shri Arun Shourie, Minister of State for Planning, Statistics and Programme Implementation and Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances regarding suggestion for relaxation of upper limit of Rs. 25 lakhs for individual works recommended under MPLADS – construction of cultural centres under MPLADS.

5.2 In his letter dated 27 January, 2001 addressed to MOS (S&PI), the hon'ble Member from Rajya Sabha stated as follows:-

> "As you are aware my main ambition is to have a chain of few centres of culture, Virsa Vihars in the Punjab. Needless to say that Punjab has been left behind culturally miserably. This backlog has to be attended to urgently.
>
> With this end in view we have engaged a reputed architect to plan the network for us. As per his recommendations duly approved by a high-powered committee with Shri I.K. Gujral as its chairman. We have laid foundation stones at Jalandhar and Kapurthala by Shri I.K. Gujral presided over by Shri Prakash Singh Badal, Chief Minister, Punjab. The foundation stone laying at Amritsar was withheld due to inavailability of both Shri Gujral and the Chief Minister of Punjab during the period.
>
> As per the specifications prepared by the architect, I had sanctioned Rs. 82.50 lakh for Jalandhar, Rs. 1.20 crore for Kapurthala and Rs. 86.25 lakh for Amritsar vide my letter dated 19 August, 2000. This amount it seems has not been made available to various centres because of technical formalities. Unless the amount unspent in my account is less than now Rs. 50.00 lakh they can't allot additional funds. Since Jalandhar, Kapurthala and Amritsar are going to be huge projects, it involves your kind intervention so that the funds are made available to them immediately and the work can start. I have hardly three years left and I am keen that I complete this project during my tenure. I would like to have 3 more similar centres if I can.
>
> In case you have any difficulty I would suggest that Amritsar where the foundation stone has not been laid can be held over for a few more months but funds for Jalandhar and Kapurthala should be made available immediately."

5.3 The Ministry in their communication dated 8 March, 2001 stated as under:-

> "In this connection, it is stated that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of cultural centre vide item No. 6 of Appendix-I of the Guidelines on MPLADS. However, para 4.1 of the extant Guidelines on MPLADS lays down that the cost of an individual work should not normally exceed Rs. 25 lakhs.

This upper limit is, however, relaxable in cases requiring higher investment depending upon nature of the work. Since Shri Duggal intend to recommend cultural centres where cost is much above the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs, it is requested that the matter may be placed before the Committees on MPLADS of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha for consideration."

Recommendation

5.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding seeking relaxation of upper limit of Rs. 25 lakhs for individual works for construction of cultural centres under MPLADS in Punjab. The Committee approve the proposal as the Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of cultural centres vide Item No. 6 of Appendix-I of the Guidelines. Accordingly, the Committee recommend to allow relaxation of upper limit of Rs. 25 lakhs for construction of cultural centres in Punjab as proposed by hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha.

VI

Suggestion regarding review of functioning of MPLAD Scheme

*****

6.1 Shri Kuldip Nayar, MP (RS) addressed a letter dated 26th April, 2001 to the hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha suggesting therein that a Joint Parliamentary Committee be constituted to look into the functioning of the Scheme, particularly in the light of the observations made by the Comptroller & Auditor General of India.

6.2 In this connection, it is mentioned that C&AG of India in their Report No. 3A(Civil), Union Government for the year ending 31st March, 2000 has, inter alia, pointed out some irregularities, loopholes, mal-administration and deficiencies in the quality of work and the utilisation of Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) Funds.

6.3 Shri Kuldip Nayar, MP (RS) in his letter stated as follows :-

> "The functioning of the MPLAD Scheme needs overhaul and I think a Joint Parliamentary Committee should look into the whole thing, particularly when the Auditor General has made certain observations.
>
> My experience is very sad. I am now entering the fourth year of my 6-year-term and the money I have been allocated so far is Rs. 50 lakhs for Srinagar and only a few days earlier, another Rs. 50 lakhs for Guwahati. The argument given by the Department is that the Deputy Commissioner concerned has not rendered his accounts. This is not true because the details which the Srinagar Deputy Commissioner sent, are very clear but I do not know what the Department needs. In any case, the members' fate is dependent on the Deputy Commissioner to whom he/she may have allocated the initial sum of Rs. 50 lakhs.
>
> My impression is that the Government is short of funds and hence it delays the allocation. The Department concerned gives one reason or the other not to transfer the amount to the member concerned.
>
> There was an assurance given in the Rajya Sabha that the matter will be discussed. For obvious reasons it has not been done.
>
> Please look into the matter."

Recommendation

6.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding review of functioning of MPLAD Scheme particularly in the light of observations made by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in their Report No. 3 A(civil), Union Government, for the year ending 31 March, 2000. The Committee are of the views that as both the Committees of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on the MPLAD Scheme, are already in existence, therefore, there appears no need to constitute a Joint Parliamentary Committee to look into the functioning of the Scheme.

VII

Suggestion regarding use of MPLADS funds for purchase of a bus for Government Girls Degree College in Udhampur Parliamentary constituency in Jammu and Kashmir

*****

7.1 Prof. Chaman Lal Gupta, Minister of State for Civil Aviation addressed a letter dated 9 January, 2001 to hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS regarding use of MPLADS funds for purchase of a bus for Government Girls Degree College in Udhampur Parliamentary Constituency in Jammu and Kashmir for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

7.2 The hon'ble Minister, in his letter stated as follows:-

> "There is a Government Girls Degree College in Udhampur District of my Constituency which is located at a distance of about 2 Kms. from the city. No local transport is available for the purpose of carrying the girl students from city to the college.
>
> I had accordingly, recommended for purchase of a bus for use of the girl students of this Degree College for their to and fro journey to the college. As the purchase of bus is not permitted under MPLADS, I am writing to you to request you to place the matter before the MPLADS Committee for granting relaxation in this case.
>
> I may mention that the college will meet the running/operating cost of the bus like fuel, general maintenance/servicing/wear & tear etc. The college will also pay the wages and salaries of the bus driver and the attendant. The college already has a garage for safe custody of the bus.
>
> Keeping in view that providing a bus to this Government Girls College will benefit a large number of girl students for attending their college, may I request you to kindly make a relaxation and allow purchase of bus from my MPLADS funds for this college, which is located in a disturbed district of J&K."

7.3 The proposal was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for obtaining comments thereon. The Ministry in their communication dated 19 March, 2001 stated as under:-

> "The guidelines do not permit purchase of any type of vehicle except ambulances for Government hospitals and reputed service organizations with certain conditions. The guidelines permit works which are developmental in nature, which may lead to creation of durable assets. There is a specific restriction on incurring revenue expenditure and purchase of inventory item. Therefore, the proposal for purchase of bus for school/college does not fit into the framework of the Guidelines on MPLADS."

Recommendation

7.4 The Committee after considering the proposal of hon'ble Minister of State for Civil Aviation regarding use of MPLADS funds for purchase of a bus for Government Girls Degree College in Udhampur Parliamentary constituency in Jammu and Kashmir, do not approve the suggestion on the ground that there is no provision in the Guidelines on MPLADS for purchase of any type of vehicle except ambulances for Government hospitals and reputed service organisations with certain conditions. The Committee are of the view that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit works which are developmental in nature and lead to creation of durable assets. There is also specific restriction on incurring revenue expenditure and purchase of inventory items. Therefore, the Committee reject the proposal.

VIII

Suggestion regarding construction of Foot Over Bridge across the River Salandi in Orissa under MPLADS

8.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 29 June/2 July, 2001 to Lok Sabha Secretariat enclosing therewith a copy of letter dated 6 June, 2001 from the Collector, District Bhadrak, Orissa regarding proposal of Shri Arjun Charan Sethi, hon'ble Minister of Water Resources for construction of Foot Over Bridge across the River Salandi in Orissa under MPLADS for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

8.2 In his letter, addressed to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, the Collector, Bhadrak stated as follows:-

> "In inviting a reference to the letter on the subject cited above, I am to say that construction of bridge at Town Police Station Chhak has been changed to construction of Foot bridge over river Salandi at Dhobaghat at Kuanah village with Rs.56.00 lakhs as per recommendation of MP (Lok Sabha) Bhadrak and communicated to you vide our Memo. No.928/P. dated 22.5.2001.
>
> Now, the estimate has been received for Rs.70.00 lakhs from Block Development Officer, Bhadrak towards construction of above bridge project. The bridge project was considered for sanction in view of the guidelines contained at para 4.1 with amendment vide letter No.C/20/2000-MPLADS dated 26.5.2000 that "amount higher than Rs.25.00 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of work. In case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent."
>
> Hence, the above bridge project costing more than Rs.25.00 lakhs may kindly be considered in view of public interest and necessary clearance may please be communicated at the earliest. In anticipation of clearance, I am transmitting the plan/estimate to Chief Engineer, P.R. Department, Orissa, Bhubaneswar for accordance of Technical Sanction. Hon'ble Union Minister, Water Resources, India is also being moved for recommendation of the balance amount required for completion of the project.

8.3 The Ministry in their communication dated 29 June/2 July, 2001 stated as under:-

> "Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the letter No. 1052/P dated 6 June, 2001 received from the Collector, Bhadrak, Orissa regarding proposal Shri Arjun Charan Sethi, hon'ble Minster of Water Resources for the construction of Foot Over Bridge across the River Salandi in Orissa at an estimated cost of Rs.70 lakhs with Rs. 56 lakhs proposed to be spent from MPLADS.

.

In accordance with the provisions contained in the existing Guidelines on MPLADS, the cost of individual work should not exceed Rs.25 lakhs which, however, can be exceeded marginally in relevant cases based on need. The request of the hon'ble Member may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS for consideration."

8.4 In this connection, para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS envisages as follows:-

> "Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs.25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs.25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example, a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs.25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

Recommendation

8.5 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Minister of Water Resources regarding construction of foot over bridge across the river Salandi in Orissa under MPLADS. The Committee recommend to allow the hon'ble Minister to contribute Rs. 56.00 lakhs for this project from his quota of MPLADS funds as it is within the provisions of Para 4.1 of the existing Guidelines on MPLADS, which envisages that the cost of individual work should not exceed Rs. 25 lakhs which, however, can be exceeded marginally in relevant cases based on need and nature of the work.

IX

Suggestion regarding purchase of Mobile Dental Van from MPLADS funds

*****

9.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 8 March, 2001 to Lok Sabha Secretariat enclosing therewith a copy of letter from Shri N.K.P. Salve, MP (RS) dated 20 February, 2001 to Deputy Chairperson, Rajya Sabha regarding purchase of Mobile Dental Van from MPLADS funds.

9.2 In his letter dated 20 February, 2001, the hon'ble Member Shri N.K.P. Salve stated as follows:-

> "This has reference to my telephonic conversation with you. I had allocated a sum of Rs.13,97,388/- for purchase of a mobile dental van for VSPM's Dental College, Digdoh Hills, Nagpur vide my letter of 19th November, 2000. Accordingly, a proposal was submitted to the Collector, Nagpur for release of the funds. The Collector, however, stated that the guidelines provide for purchase of mobile ambulance under the MPLAD fund to non-Government Organisations but not a dental van.
>
> The anomaly is far too obvious. I shall, therefore, be grateful if a circular is sent that a dental van catering to the public needs specially for rural areas can be acquired by non-government organizations out of the MPLAD fund.
>
> I have also spoken to hon'ble Shri Arun Shourie about it who has promised me to take up the matter in the Committee."

9.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 8 March, 2001 stated as under:-

> "In this connection, it is stated that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit purchase of ambulance for the Government Hospitals and service organisations like that of R.K. Mission, Red Cross, etc., and mobile dispensaries can be procured for Government and Panchayat Raj Institutions. This Ministry had circulated detailed guidelines on 15 October, 1999 to all DCs/DMs regarding providing Ambulance to NGOs. In accordance with para 3(viii) of these instructions mobile dispensaries cannot be provided to the NGO in the name of the ambulance or otherwise. It is requested that the proposal may please be placed before the Committee on MPLADS (Lok Sabha) for its consideration."

Recommendation

9.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member, Rajya Sabha for taking permission for purchase of a Mobile Dental Van from MPLADS funds. The Committee while keeping in view the Guidelines on MPLADS as well as the instructions dated 15.10.1999 issued by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to all District Commissioners/District Magistrates which stipulate that mobile dispensaries cannot be provided to the NGOs in the name of the ambulance or otherwise, reject the proposal of hon'ble Member for purchase of Mobile Dental Van under MPLADS.

X

Suggestion regarding funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds

10.1 The Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 21 May, 2001 to the Secretary General, Lok Sabha regarding a suggestion for funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds, for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

10.2 In his letter, the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as under:-

> "I am writing this in connection with establishment of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) proposed to be constructed at Guwahati at an estimated cost of Rs.13.61 crores. Initially, it was envisaged to partly fund this project to the tune of Rs.78 lakhs through allocation of Rs.2.00 lakhs out of the MPLADS funds of each MP from the North Eastern States. During 1998 a proposal in this regard was received in this Ministry from hon'ble Speaker of Assam Legislative Assembly. The Ministry clarified that the proposal could not be covered under MPLADS, as the extant Guidelines prohibited any work relating to office building as well as allocation of funds by the MPs outside their constituency. Subsequently, the matter was under consideration of the Planning Commission for allocation of additional funds for the purpose. The Planning Commission has referred the case back to this Ministry with the following remarks of the Deputy Chairman:-
>
> "*The Speaker of Assam Assembly has written to say that MPs are willing to contribute to the project. Is there any difficulty?*
>
> The proposal to contribute MPLADS by MPs of Rajya Sabha as well as Lok Sabha from the North Eastern States may kindly be placed before the Rajya Sabha/Lok Sabha Committee on MPLADS, for their consideration in the light of the following facts:-
>
> (a) Lok Sabha MPs can allocate funds within their constituencies. Hence, Lok Sabha MPs from North Eastern States, except the MP of Lok Sabha from Assam in whose constituency the said Institute falls cannot allocate funds for the said Institute under the present Guidelines.
>
> (b) Elected Rajya Sabha MPs can allocate funds in one or more districts in the State from which they have been elected. Hence, only Rajya Sabha MPs elected from Assam can allocate funds for taking up works permissible in the Guidelines, in the State of Assam.

(c) There is a specific restriction on construction of office building, residential buildings and other buildings relating to Central or State Government Department, Agencies or Organisation.

If the proposal is to be allowed under MPLADS, relaxations with regard to above points would be necessary."

Recommendation

10.3 The Committee note the proposal regarding funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds and reject it as the extant Guidelines on MPLADS prohibit any work relating to construction of office building as well as allocation of funds by the Members of Parliament outside their constituency except in the case of natural calamity of rare severity.

XI

Suggestion regarding appointing of executing agency by Member of Parliament for works recommended under MPLADS

11.1 Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi, MP (LS) addressed a letter dated 20 April, 2001 along with enclosures to the hon'ble Speaker suggesting therein appointing of executive agency by Member of Parliament himself for works recommended by him under MPLADS.

11.2 Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi, MP (LS), in his letter stated as follows:-

> "That when a proposal under MPLADS forwarded by the MP to district collector stating the name of a particular executing agency, it should not be changed by district collector without consent of the MP.
>
> Now-a-days elections for Zila Parishad, Panchayat Committees and Gram Panchayats in rural areas and municipality, city council and municipal corporation in urban areas are being held on political basis, however, there was no such system in the past. As a result of this, when some work under MPLADS is assigned to these bodies, it is not completed in time. Moreover, it is also propagandised that the MP did not wish to assign this job and it was procured from the District Collector after his approval.
>
> That if an MP wants to get some work executed by a registered agency, district collector should appoint that agency as an executing agency and he should not have power to change that particular executing agency.
>
> That there is no uniformity in the decision of the district collectors. Many a times, names of executing agencies are changed under the pressure of the Government.
>
> That approved executing agencies had been changed by the Collector of my constituency, Jodhpur. These are being rechanged.
>
> That work of Bhavi village of my constituency was given by collector to municipality Bilada, and after BJP had occupied municipality Bilada, the work was assigned to Mahavir International Kharina Meethapur. The Sarpanch of Bhavi village was also entitled, but his name was not considered, as he belongs to BJP.
>
> That Bhavi is village panchayat headquarter. The elected Sarpanch belongs to BJP. Newly elected Chairman, Bilada Municipality belongs to BJP. For this, District Collector, Jodhpur under the pressure of State Government, did not appoint any of these two agencies as executing agency but on the contrary wrote that Bilada Municipality is unwilling to get the work executed and therefore Mahaveer International, Kharia Meethapur is appointed as Executing agency Chairman of which is Congress Leader Prakash Lodha.

That sometime back, I recommended work for Shiksha Samiti Ramanagabas Kalla in my constituency and this agency executed some work amounting to about Rs. 5 lakh in the village. At that time Sarpanch in the village belonged to BJP. Later on after elections the Sarpanch came from congress and for this reason village Panchayat Ramangabas was appointed as executing agency instead of Shikshan Sanstha Ramangabad Kalla.

That in Khejdali Kalla village in my constituency Int Utpadak Sahakari Samiti was appointed as executing agency for works which were sanctioned because the then Sarpanch of the village belonged to BJP but after elections he was replaced by one of the Congressmen. For this reason village Panchayat Khejadi Kalla was appointed as executive agency while all the MPLADS works were previously executed by Int Utpadak Sahakari Samiti in the village.

That there are two Members of Rajya Sabha also from my Lok Sabha constituency – one is Dr. L.M. Singhavi, and the other is External Affairs Minister Mr. Jaswant Singh. Works recommended by both of these MPs are executed by the agencies but for those of local MP executing agency is changed under pressure from the State Government as they are prejudiced and do not want the local MP to get the credit for such public works.

That the District Collector should be vested with powers for appointing executive agency only in relation to governmental works and District Collector should not have power to change the executive agency decided by the MP.

Therefore, I request the Committee that powers to appoint the Executive agency should be vested in the MP only in order to derive maximum benefit out of the scheme."

11.3 The representation of the hon'ble Member was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation requesting to provide their factual comments thereon.

11.4 In this connection, Para 2.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS envisages as follows:-

"Each MP will give a choice of works to the concerned Head of the district who will get them implemented by following the established procedures, that is, he may be guided by the procedure laid down by the State Government subject to these Guidelines. In regard to works in urban areas their implementation can be done through Commissioners/Chief Executive Officers of Corporations, Municipalities, etc., or through the Heads of District concerned as per the option of the MPs. Implementation agencies can be either Government or Panchayati Raj institutions or any other reputed non-governmental organisation who may be considered by the District Head as capable of implementing the works satisfactorily. Engagement of private contractors is prohibited, wherever extant Guidelines do not permit such engagement. For purposes of execution of works through Public Works Department (PWD), wings not necessarily exclusively dealing with civil construction, but having competence in civil construction can be engaged-like for example, Public Health Engineering, Rural Housing Departments/wings, Housing Boards, Electricity Boards, Urban

Development Authorities etc. The Head of the District shall identify the agency through which a particular work recommended by the MP should be executed."

11.5 It may also be mentioned that the Committee on MPLADS (LS) in Para 11.2, in their Second Report, had recommended inter-alia as follows:-

"The Committee peruse Para 2.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS relating to the aspect of identification of an Agency through which a particular work was to be executed under MPLADS. The Committee are of the opinion that Para 2.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS was not clear as to who was the final authority – Member of Parliament or District Collector – to decide about the agency through which a particular work was to be executed under MPLADS. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should make it clear and issue necessary instructions in this regard without any delay. The Committee feel that Member being representatives of the Public should have the discretion in the identification of agency through which a particuar work was to be executed under MPLADS afterall his discretion was limited only to a Government Agency of the State Government."

11.6 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their Action Taken Note on the above mentioned recommendation, stated as follows:-

"The proposal alongwith the recommendation of the Lok Sabha Committee has been forwarded to the Rajya Sabha Committee on MPLADS. Further action will be taken on receipt of recommendation of the Rajya Sabha Committee."

Recommendation

11.7 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding appointing of executing agency by Member of Parliament for works recommended by him under MPLADS and reiterate their earlier recommendation given in Para 11.2 in their Second Report. The Committee also recommend that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should expedite the recommendation made by the Committee on MPLADS (Rajya Sabha) on this aspect.

XII

Suggestion regarding purchase of completed/incomplete buildings under MPLADS

12.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 29 March, 2001 to Lok Sabha Secretariat enclosing therewith a copy of letter dated 14th March, 2001 addressed to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation by Collector, South Goa district, Margao regarding a suggestion for purchase of completed/ incomplete buildings under MPLADS on the basis of a proposal of Shri Ramakant S. Angle, MP (LS) for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

12.2 The Collector, South Goa District, Margao, in his letter stated as follows:-

"The Manager, Shree Gujarati Samaj, Aquem Margao, has moved a proposal for providing a duplex bungalow to the disabled students for being used as a hostel, free of charge.

The said Samaj is running a school for the deaf and dumb students for the last fifteen years which is recognised by the Directorate of Education, Government of Goa. A section for the mentally disabled children, has also been started three years ago and now they are planning to start another section for the visually handicapped children. Quite a good number of such children do not avail of the schooling facility for want of a hostel as they are unable to travel long distances by public transport.

As such the Educational Trust of the Samaj has decided to start a hostel which will be totally free for the economically backward sections of the society, irrespective of caste, religion, etc.

The Goa Housing Board is ready to sell a duplex bungalow, on special concession basis. The Manager of the school has therefore requested the hon'ble MP (LS), Shri Ramakant Angle, to be kind enough to help them. The MP vide his recommendation dated 13.2.2001 has requested to treat this as a special case since the beneficiaries would be deaf, dumb and handicapped children.

As per existing Guidelines works are to be undertaken through the various executing agencies of the State Government. In the present case proposal is for outright purchase of already constructed building. Since, the Guidelines do not provide for such acquisition you are requested to clarify whether we can sanction funds for this project. This issue was discussed during the meeting convened by hon'ble Minister of State for Statistics and Programme Implementation, in Goa recently wherein he assured to consider the proposal."

12.3 The Ministry vide their communication dated 29th March 2001 stated as under:-

"The undersigned is directed to forward a copy of the letter No. 1/18/99/MP/2597 dated 14/3/2001 received from the Collector, South Goa

District, Margao on the above mentioned subject. The letter contains a proposal for purchase of a duplex bungalow for Shree Gujarati Samaj for use as a hostel for the deaf and dumb students. The details of the proposal are explained in the letter. The Guidelines provide for construction of buildings for schools, hostels, libraries and other buildings of educational institutions belonging to Government or local bodies. Such buildings belonging to aided institutions and unaided but recognised institutions can also be constructed, provided, however, that the institutions be in existence for not less than two years. There is restriction on acquisition of land. There is no provision in the Guidelines on MPLADS for purchase of ready built or incomplete buildings. Thus, the Guidelines permit construction of durable assets on land belonging to Government or even on land belonging to private organization subject to conditions stipulated in Para 2.6 of the Guidelines. The proposal therefore requires amendment in the Guidelines. It is requested that the matter may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS for consideration."

Recommendation

12.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding seeking permission to purchase completed/incomplete buildings under MPLADS. The Committee are of the view that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of durable assets on land belonging to Government or even on land belonging to private organisation subject to conditions stipulated in Para 2.6 of the Guidelines. Therefore, the Committee reject the proposal of hon'ble Member as there is no provision in the Guidelines on MPLADS for purchase of ready built or incomplete buildings.

XIII
Seeking permission to contribute Rs.1.00 crore from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families in Churachandpur District, in Manipur

13.1 Shri Holkhomang Haokip, MP (LS) addressed a letter dated 17 July, 2001 along with enclosures to hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS regarding seeking permission to contribute Rs. 1.00 crore from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families in Churachandpur District, in Manipur, for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

13.2 Shri Holkhomang Haokip, MP (LS) in his letter stated as follows:-

> "Kindly refer to letter No. 9/58/MPLADSC/2001 dated the 16th July, 2001 to the subject noted above, I once again request you to re-consider my representation based on only Illustrative List of works that can be taken up under MPLADS at Annexure`A' under the Guidelines amended at Para 1.3 on MPLAD Scheme. I actually made a fundamental mistake in my over enthusiasm to extend help to the victims of communal riots.
>
> The money contributed will go to the affected two communities through the Chairman, DRDA, Churachandpur District, Manipur who is at present the Deputy Commissioner of the District. He will be instructed to follow the Guidelines on listed works to create community assets only. The Ministry of Home Affairs and the PMO agreed to allot Rs.5 (five crores) from non-lapsable fund of the Government of India for the North-East.
>
> I would request you to grant permission to contribute Rs. 1(one) crore from my MPLADS fund for 2000-2001.

1)	School/Hostel Buildings	=	141	villages
2)	Community Hall/Buildings	=	31	villages
3)	Social Forestry	=	550	Acres
4)	Orphanage-Hostel Building	=	2	villages
5)	Handloom/weaving (80 Centres) work sheds	=	80	Nos.
6)	Dispensary Buildings	=	14	villages
7)	Drinking water supply	=	44	villages
8)	Population (affected)	=	25,987	Nos.
9)	Killed	=	1,102	Nos.
10)	Villages (affected)	=	317	Nos."

13.3 The representation of hon'ble Member was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for obtaining their factual comments thereon. The Ministry in their reply dated 3 August, 2001 inter-alia stated as follows:-

> "The undersigned is directed to say that the case is not covered under Para 1.3 of the Guidelines which enables MPs to spend MPLADS funds outside their constituency, for an amount upto Rs. 10 lakhs per calamity in cases of natural calamity of rare severity. The hon'ble MP can recommend works in areas falling under his constituency only. The permissibility of the works proposed by the MP is as under:-

(i) School/hostel building:- Under SI. No.1 Appendix-I of the Guidelines, construction of building for school, hostel, libraries and other buildings of educational institutions belonging to Government/local bodies is permissible. Such buildings belonging to aided and unaided but recognised institutions can also be constructed provided, however, that the institution being in existence for not less than 2 years.

(ii) Community Halls/buildings:- Construction of community halls/buildings is permissible under SI. No.6 of Appendix-I of the Guidelines.

(iii) Social forestry:- Special forestry, farm forestry, horticulture, pastures, parks and gardens in Government and community lands or other surrendered lands is permissible under SI. No. 7 Appendix-I.

(iv) Orphanage-hostel buildings:- Such buildings are not covered under the Illustrative List given in Appendix-I of the Guidelines.

(v) Handloom/Weaving Worksheds:- Construction of common worksheds is permissible in slums and for artisans vide SI. No. 19 of Appendix-I.

(vi) Dispensary buildings:- Construction of dispensary buildings is permissible under SI. No. 14 of Appendix-I.

(vii) Drinking Water Supply:- is permissible under SI. No.2 of Appendix-I"

13.4 The Committee noted the proposal of hon'ble Member during their sitting held on 7 August, 2001 regarding seeking permission to contribute Rs. 1.00 crore from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families in Churachandpur District, in Manipur. The Committee agreed with the comments of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in this regard that the case is not covered under Para 1.3 of the amended Guidelines on MPLADS which enables MPs to spend MPLADS funds outside their constituency in cases of natural calamity of rare severity. The Committee were of the view that the hon'ble Member can recommend works in areas falling under his constituency only and these works should be recommended as per the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee did not approve the proposal of hon'ble Member on the grounds that it amounts to using the MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families affected by ethnic clashes in Manipur and it was against the Guidelines on MPLADS.

Recommendation

13.5 The Committee review its decision taken on 7 August, 2001 regarding the proposal of Shri Holkhomang Haokip, MP (LS) for seeking permission to contribute Rs. 1.00 crore from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families in Churachandpur District in Manipur. The Committee after having reconsidered the proposal, allow the hon'ble Member to recommend works in areas falling under his Parliamentary constituency only and these works should be recommended as per the Guidelines on MPLADS.

XIV

Request regarding relaxation of the ceiling of Rs.25 lakhs for projects under MPLADS by Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad, MP (RS)

*****

14.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation forwarded a letter dated 2 August, 2001 enclosing therewith a copy of letter dated 22 May, 2001 from Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad, MP (RS) addressed to Deputy Chairperson, Rajya Sabha and a copy of letter dated 31 July 2001 from Rajya Sabha Secretariat to the Ministry regarding relaxation of the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs for two projects under MPLADS, for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha.

14.2 Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad, MP (RS) in his letter dated 22 May, 2001 addressed to hon'ble Deputy Chairperson, Rajya Sabha, stated as follows:-

> "Myself, Dr. U. Venkateswarlu, MP (LS), Tenali, Dr. C. Narayana Reddy, Dr. M. Mohan Babu, Dr. Y. Radhakrishana Murthy. Members of Rajya Sabha allotted Rs. 10 lakhs each totalling Rs.50 lakhs for the construction of a Seminar Hall at Koneru Lakshmaiah College of Engineering, Vaddeswarum of Guntur District. The College was established 20 years back and recognised by All India Council of Technical Education and Government of Andhra Pradesh and affiliated to Nagarjuna University, Guntur. The College is situated in the rural area. Therefore, the Seminar Hall will be useful for both the College Students and the local people.
>
> Myself and Dr. U. Venkateswarlu, MP (LS) Tenali proposed to allot Rs. 25 lakhs and Rs. 15 lakhs respectively for construction of buildings for the library at Vignan Engineering College, Vadlamudi of Guntur District. This College is also situated in the rural area. This library also will cater the needs of both the students and the local village people. Hence I request you to relax the Guidelines issued vide RC No. C/20/2000-MPLADS dated 26.5.2000 under the MPLADS amending Guidelines issued at Para 4.1 which says MPs can suggested individual works consisting more than Rs. 25 lakhs for each work. It will not be out of place to mention that both the Institutions come under the purview of MPLADS Guidelines.
>
> The work mentioned at item at Para No.1 is pending since June, 2000. Hence, I request you to relax the above rules and advise the District Collector, Guntur for immediate execution of the works."

14.3 Rajya Sabha Secretariat in their letter dated 31 July, 2001 addressed to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as under:-

> "I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the letter from Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad, MP (Rajya Sabha) addressed to Dr. Najma Heptulla, Deputy Chairperson, Rajya Sabha which is self explanatory. The Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha at its meeting held on 23.7.2001 considered the matter and agreed with the request from Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad and allowed Members to

contribute jointly from their MPLADS funds for construction of seminar hall at Koneru Lakshmaiah College of Engineering, Vaddeswarum of Guntur District and a library at Vignan Engineering College, Vadlamudi of Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh."

14.4 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 2 August, 2001 stated as follows:-

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a copy of the letter No. RS.23(iii)/2001-MPLADS dated the 31st July, 2001 received from the Rajya Sabha Secretariat along with enclosures and to say that the Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha has recommended relaxation to the proposals of Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad, MP (Rajya Sabha), relating to contribution jointly by five hon'ble MPs, out of which one belongs to Lok Sabha (Tenali constituency) and four belong to Rajya Sabha from Andhra Pradesh @Rs.10 lakhs each for the construction of a Seminar Hall in a Koneru Lakshmaiah College of Engineering, Guntur. The Committee has also recommended for another proposal of Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad for contribution of Rs. 25 lakhs by him and Rs. 15 lakhs by Dr. U. Venkateswarlu, hon'ble MP, Lok Sabha from Tenali constituency, in Andhra Pradesh for the construction of buildings for the Library of an Vignan Engineering College, Vadlamudi in Guntur District.

As per Item 1 Appendix-I of the Guidelines on MPLADS, buildings for unaided but recognised educational institutions can be constructed under the scheme provided that the institution is in existence for not less than two years.

It is requested that the proposal of Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad may be placed before the Lok Sabha Committee for consideration."

Recommendation

14.5 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding seeking relaxation of the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs for projects under MPLADS and approve it as it is well within the Guidelines on MPLADS and has also been already approved by the Committee on MPLADS (Rajya Sabha).

XV

Representation regarding permission to construct individual houses in the earthquake affected Dholaveera village in Gujarat under MPLADS

15.1 The Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 14 June, 2001 to the Secretary General, Lok Sabha enclosing therewith a copy of letter dated 6 June, 2001 from Shri Pramod Mahajan, hon'ble Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology to Shri Arun Shourie, Minister of State for Planning, Statistics and Programme Implementation and Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances regarding seeking permission to construct individual houses in the earthquake affected Dholaveera village in Gujarat under MPLADS for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

15.2 In his letter dated 6 June, 2001 addressed to Shri Arun Shourie, Shri Pramod Mahajan stated as follows:-

> "Subsequent to the earthquake in Gujarat, I had offered to the Chief Minister of Gujarat to take up a village for re-construction. The Chief Minister of Gujarat had indicated to me that I could take up the village Dholaveera in Kutch District for re-construction. The work of re-building in village Dholaveera involves construction of 550 houses involving a population of 1644. I had promised to give Rs.2 crores from Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme Funds for the same. You have been kind enough to have these funds released to the Chief Secretary, Gujarat for taking up the re-construction work.
>
> It has been brought to my notice that these funds would not be allowed to be used for re-construction of new houses and would instead be permitted only for re-construction of amenities like schools, health centers, community centers etc. You would appreciate that re-building individual houses is an equally important task and also requires huge resources to accomplish. I feel that we may make a one time exception to permit the use of MPLADS funds for the re-construction of individual houses.
>
> I am sure you would have the matter examined and issue instructions for the same urgently so that the actual execution could start without any delay."

15.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation vide their communication dated 14 June, 2001 stated as under:-

> "Please find enclosed a copy of the D.O. letter dated 6 June, 2001 addressed to hon'ble Minister of State (S&PI) by Shri Pramod Mahajan, hon'ble Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology regarding his request for construction of 550 houses in the village Dholaveera which is one of the earthquake affected villages in Gujarat. The Guidelines on MPLAS lay down specific restriction on creation of assets for individual benefits and hence construction of individual houses is not permitted under the present Guidelines on MPLADS. Further, the Lok Sabha Committee on MPLADS and the Rajya Sabha

Committee on MPLADS are considering the mode of utilising the funds contributed by the Lok Sabha MPs and the Rajya Sabha MPs respectively, i.e., the nature of assets to be created and the agency to whom the reconstruction work should be assigned. The request of the hon'ble Minister for one-time exception to permit use of MPLADS funds contributed by him for construction of individual houses in village Dholaveera may, therefore, be put up before the Committees on MPLADS for consideration and suitable decision in the matter."

15.4 In this connection, Item one of the List of Works not permissible under MPLADS, Appendix-II of the Guidelines on MPLADS envisages as follows:-

"Office buildings**, residential buildings** and other buildings relating to Central or State Governments, Departments, Agencies or Organisations."

15.5 The Committee on MPLADS in their sitting held on 7 August, 2001 considered the proposal of hon'ble Minister and decided as follows:-

"The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology and decided to consider it later on after having visited the earthquake affected areas of Gujarat and finalisation of the agency for construction and rehabilitation works in those areas."

15.6 In this connection, a copy of letter dated 10 August, 2001 enclosing therewith a copy of minutes of the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha held on 23 July, 2001 addressed to the Personal Secretary to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology has been received indicating the approval of the aforesaid proposal by the Committee, as follows:-

"The Chairperson then, informed the Members of the Committee regarding the request of Shri Pramod Mahajan, Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology to provide the entire amount of Rs. two crores for restructuring a totally devastated village Dholaveera in District Kutch. She also informed the Members that, in the past the Committee has never given permission for building private houses as the Guidelines on MPLADS lay down specific restriction on creation of assets for individual benefits. Hence construction of individual houses was not permitted under the present Guidelines on MPLADS. However, the Committee noted that Shri Mahajan has sought one time relaxation in MPLADS Guidelines for use of funds for construction of 550 houses in Dholaveera Village. In view of the massive destruction that took place in the village and the need for rehabilitation of the affected people the Committee agreed to the request on the condition that the entire work will have to be got done by the agency selected by the Committee. Further, Shri Mahajan would have to meet the fund requirements of the project in full. This however did not include the cost on electricity, water and telephones etc.

The Chairperson informed the Members of the Committee that there would be around 550 houses, the cost of construction would be Rs. 38,000/- per house.

The Committee also directed the representatives of HUDCO to furnish the details of estimates regarding the construction of houses in the Dholaveera village.

The Chairperson informed the Committee that Shri Mahajan had agreed to provide more funds for toilets, community centres, health centres, etc. If need be, he would be providing more funds from his MPLADS share of next year."

Recommendation

15.7 The Committee consider the proposal of hon'ble Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology for taking permission to construct individual houses in the earthquake affected Dholaveera village in Gujarat under MPLADS. The Committee note that the Guidelines on MPLADS lay down specific restriction on creation of assets for individual benefits and the construction of individual houses was not permitted under the present Guidelines. The Committee also note that the Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha have already approved the aforesaid proposal of hon'ble Minister in their meeting held on 23 July, 2001. The Committee keeping in view the urgency of the need of shelters for the homeless people in earthquake affected village Dholaveera in Gujarat approve the proposal of hon'ble Minister for construction of 550 houses in that village as a special case. The Committee recommend that it would be a one time relaxation under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

XVI

Amendment in formats placed at Appendix-3 and Appendix-4 of the Guidelines on MPLADS

16.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 29th May, 2001 to Lok Sabha Secretariat regarding amendment in formats placed at Appendix-3 and Appendix-4 of the Guidelines on MPLAD Scheme for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

16.2 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their letter, stated as under:-

> "The Nodal District Heads are supposed to send to this Ministry, every month, information in the formats placed at Appendix-3 & Appendix-4 of the Guidelines. The information received in these formats is used for deciding the eligibility for release of subsequent instalment in respect of a Lok Sabha constituency or a Rajya Sabha MP. The information contained in these formats is also used for bringing a Monthly Report for the purpose of monitoring of the Scheme.
>
> The following changes have been felt necessary in these formats:-
>
> i) The title for Appendix-3 & Appendix-4 reads as follows:-
>
> "Format for the purpose of release of funds under Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS)".
>
> This title gives an indication that this information is to be used for the purpose of only release of funds. The funds are released on the basis of cost of works sanctioned and other information contained in the format is for purpose of monitoring. It is, therefore, felt to change the title to read as follows:-
>
> "Format for information on release of funds, works sanctioned and expenditure under Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS)".
>
> ii) The first line below the heading reads as:-
>
> "Statement of Expenditure under MPLADS (upto date:……..)".
>
> This line gives an indication that this is a Statement of Expenditure. The word "Expenditure" in this line can be replaced with the word "information".

iii) In Column 1(a) years have been indicated up to 1999-2000. When we are amending these annexures, we may also add two more years, 2000-2001 & 2001-2002.

iv) Sometime back we had issued instructions to all the State Governments to distribute the unspent balance of predecessor Rajya Sabha MPs among their successors. This fund transferred from predecessor to successor has also to be taken into account for release of funds and for Monthly Report. It is, therefore, necessary to have a column added in Appendix-4 as follows:-

1(c): Unspent balance of predecessor MPs received for the MP.

Accordingly, with this addition, the column 1(c) will be renumbered as 1(d).

v) The Footnote No.(1) which indicates the next due instalment of Rs. 50 lakhs needs to be amended to read as "100 lakhs" as the funds are now being released in instalments of Rs. 1 crore each.

vi) The Footnote No.(iii) indicates that sanctioned amount is the cost of such schemes only for which financial sanction has already been issued. The financial sanction has a different meaning in different States. In some States, financial sanction means sending advance funds to the implementing agency for implementation of work indicated in the sanction. We have issued instructions to all the District Heads to issue financial sanction up to the entitlement of the MP without waiting for the funds from the Ministry. The District Heads in those States where financial sanction means forwarding funds to the implementing agencies find it difficult to issue such financial sanction without availability of the funds. The purpose of having this clause is that the District Heads need not include such sanctions which have been issued without ascertaining the estimated cost of the project and without finalizing the plans and estimates.

The Footnote No. (iii), therefore, needs to be amended to read as follows:-

"Sanctioned amount is the cost of such schemes only for which sanctions have already been issued after finalising plans & estimates. Cost of schemes which have got only administrative approval should not be reported as sanctioned in Column 3".

Before the above changes are incorporated in Appendix-3 & 4, it is requested that the matter may kindly be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, for their consideration."

Recommendation

16.3 The Committee peruse the proposal of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation regarding amendment in formats placed at Appendix-3

and Appendix-4 of the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee, while agreeing with the views of the Ministry that there was necessity to change the formats of the Guidelines on MPLADS particularly at Appendix-3 and Appendix-4, approve the amendments in these appendices as proposed by the Ministry. The Committee also recommend that a column should be incorporated in the format placed at Appendix-3 of the Guidelines showing information regarding the balance amount left under the MPLADS funds after having received suggestions/recommendations by the Member of Parliament regarding implementation of works under MPLADS. The Committee also desire that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should be requested to issue necessary instructions to all the DMs, directing them to send a copy of the sanction letter pertaining to the sanction of any project/scheme to the concerned MP also.

XVII

Representation regarding purchase of digitization equipment under MPLADS for Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samastha (SGS) run by a registered body

17.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 30 May, 2001 to Lok Sabha Secretariat enclosing therewith a copy of letter from Dr. Y. Radha Krishna Murty, MP (RS) addressed to hon'ble Minister for Planning and Programme Implementation and a copy of letter dated 5 March, 2001 from Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samastha to Dr. Y. Radha Krishna Murty, MP (RS) regarding purchase of digitization equipment under MPLADS for Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samastha (SGS) run by a registered society for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

17.2 In his letter dated 4 May, 2001 Dr. Y. Radha Krishna Murty, MP (RS) stated as follows:-

> "Kindly recall my conversation with you in Rajya Sabha on 26 April regarding possibility of allotment of MPLADS funds for purchasing Digitization equipment for a reputed Library by name Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samstha run by a registered society.
>
> The District Collector (Planning), Hyderabad had rejected my proposal stating that the MPLADS Guidelines do not permit such a proposal for computerization and Digitization programme by Societies.
>
> You were kind enough to advise me to write to you the details of the issue with copy to the Chairman, MPLADS Committee and to the hon'ble Speaker.
>
> I am herewith enclosing the relevant material along with a copy of my earlier proposal and a copy of the District Collector's (Planning) letter.
>
> I request you to take up this issue with the Committee to modify the Guidelines so that this proposal which is useful to the public as well as Research Scholars using this great library can be accepted."

17.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation vide their communication dated 30 May, 2001 stated as follows:-

> "The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a copy of the letter dated 4.5.2001 received from Dr. Y. Radha Krishna Murty, MP (RS) along with a copy of letter dated 5.3.2001 from Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samstha on the above subject. It has been observed from the letter of SGS that the proposal for purchase of Digitization equipment would include modern computer, scanners, CD writers, CD servers, Laser printers, air-conditioners, fax machine, micro film, micro fish reader-cum-printer, the high-end Xerox machine and legal software. In this connection, it is stated that all the items in question are items of inventory, purchase of which is specifically prohibited under the existing Guidelines. The purchase of computes is allowed under MPLADS for Government and Government aided schools/educational institutions only for educational and training purposes for the benefit of students community.

It is requested that the matter may kindly be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha/Rajya Sabha for consideration."

Recommendation

17.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding purchase of digitization equipment under MPLADS for Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samastha (SGS) run by a registered body. The Committee observe that the proposal of SGS for purchase of digitization equipment would include modern computer, scanners, CD writers, CD servers, Laser printers, air-conditioners, fax machine, micro film, micro fish reader-cum-printer, the high-end Xerox machine and legal software. These items in question are items of inventory, purchase of which is specifically prohibited under the existing Guidelines on MPLADS. The purchase of computers is allowed under MPLADS for Government and Government aided schools/educational institutions only for educational and training purposes for the benefit of student community. In view of this, the Committee do not approve the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha.

XVIII

Representation regarding change of Nodal District Collector in respect of nominated MPs of Rajya Sabha

18.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation forwarded a letter dated 11 April, 2001 enclosing therewith a copy of letter dated 10 February, 2001 from Shri Kuldip Nayar, MP (RS) addressed to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation regarding change of Nodal District Collector in respect of nominated MPs of Rajya Sabha for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

18.2 In his letter, the hon'ble Member stated as follows:-

> "As already pointed out to you earlier, I want the second year of my allocation to go to Assam and the district I have selected is Guwahati. Since my term has already entered the fourth year, may I suggest that after the second year, the third year allocation may be given to Punjab and I have selected the district `Ferozepur'.
>
> I have already sent some proposals on Assam and one on Ferozepur. I shall be grateful if they are processed as soon as possible."

18.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 11 April, 2001 stated as under:-

> "Shri Kuldip Nayar is a nominated MP of Rajya Sabha since 27 August, 1997. Funds for the year 1997-98 were released to Deputy Commissioner, Srinagar on 31.03.1998. Shri Nayar made a request to change Nodal District from Srinagar to Guwahati and accordingly instalment of Rs. 50 lakhs for the year 1998-1999 was released to DC, Guwahati. The Expenditure report has not been received from DC, Srinagar and DC, Guwahati. In the meanwhile, Shri Nayar has made a request that funds for the year 1999-2001 may be released to DC, Ferozepur without waiting for receipt of Expenditure Statement.
>
> Under the existing criteria for release of funds, the next instalment of Rs. one crore is released on receipt of statement from the Nodal DC, showing the unsanctioned balance below Rs. 50 lakhs. Also there is no provision to declare more than one District as Nodal District, at a given point of time. Therefore, the request of Shri Nayar is not covered under the existing Guidelines. If the request of the hon'ble MP is accepted, the same would require amending the Guidelines. Therefore, it is requested that the matter may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS for consideration, whether to (i) allow release of funds without receipt of required report (ii) allow a nominated MP to have more than one Nodal District at a time."

Recommendation

18.4 The Committee consider the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding his request of change of Nodal District i.e., (i) allowing release of funds

without receipt of required report and (ii) allowing a nominated MP to have more than one Nodal District at a given point of time. The Committee note that the hon'ble Member had already changed his Nodal District twice and desired to change it for the third time. The Committee approve the proposal subject to the condition that this is the last change of District Nodal Officer and no further change would be considered by the Committee.

XIX

Suggestion regarding inclusion of purchase of Rotating Sprinklers under MPLADS

19.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 17th April, 2001 enclosing therewith copies of letters received from Shri B.S. Ramoowalia, MP (RS) addressed to Shri Arun Shourie, Minister of State for Planning, Statistics and Programme Implementation and Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances regarding inclusion of Rotating Sprinklers under MPLADS for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

19.2 In his letter dated 21 March, 2001, hon'ble Member stated as follows:-

> "My view is that this matter needs to be placed before the MPLADS Committees of both the Houses.
>
> What I have already written, I further send herewith a press-clipping from the Hindustan Times dated 18.2.2001 (see Annexure), in support thereof, and request that your goodself may kindly go through it.
>
> The enclosed clipping highlights the `critical' agro-climatic conditions prevailing in various States like Punjab, Haryana, Rajasthan, Gujarat, Orissa, Delhi, etc., because of deficient rains; further sinking of ground-water levels; declining reservoir storage status throughout the country; substantial fall in major crops' production, etc. The projection is an alarming situation.
>
> In such a bleak back-drop, I feel, the rotating sprinklers can, to an extent, prove useful to the farming community in arresting the declining trend. After all, this matter is basic to agro-development.
>
> The release of small amounts from MPLADS fund would, therefore, be quite appropriate, and modalities could be suitably worked out. I now leave this matter into your safe hands."

19.3 The Ministry vide their communication dated 17 April, 2001 stated as follows:-

> "The Item rotating sprinklers is classifiable as an item of inventory, purchase of which is specifically prohibited. Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of irrigation embankments or lift irrigation or water table recharging facilities, tubewells and water tanks. Apparently, the rotating sprinklers will be distributed to farmers on individual basis. The Guidelines specifically prohibited assets for individual benefit. Thus, the purchase of rotating sprinklers is not covered by these provisions. Therefore, the request of the hon'ble MP (RS) may kindly be placed before the Committee on MPLADS for its consideration."

Recommendation

19.4 The Committee after considering the proposal of hon'ble Member note

that the item rotating sprinklers is classifiable as an item of inventory and purchase of which is specifically prohibited under the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee are of the view that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of irrigation embankments or lift irrigation or water table recharging facilities, tubewells and water tanks. Apparently, the rotating sprinklers would be distributed to farmers on individual basis and the Guidelines on MPLADS specifically prohibits assets for individual benefit. Thus, the purchase of rotating sprinklers is not covered by these provisions. The Committee, therefore, do not approve the aforesaid proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha.

XX

Representation regarding utilisation of MPLADS funds for special forestry projects

20.1 Shri Jaysingrao Gaikwad Patil, Minister of State for Mines addressed a letter dated 22 March, 2001 to hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS regarding utilisation of MPLADS funds for special forestry projects.

20.2 In his letter, the hon'ble Minister stated as follows:-

> "As you are aware that, out of my MPLAD fund I am proposing to take special forestry project with people's participation. The project envisaged entire distribution of tree sampling one each to householder and the people will plant and grow the tree sampling.
>
> For this purpose roughly, the two lakhs tree sampling would cost Rs.8 lakhs at the rate of Rs.4/- per tree sampling.
>
> In this context, the illustrative list of works that can be taken up under MPLADS in Appendix-I, the prima facie include special forestry in Government, Community lands or other surrendered lands under item 7. But I need your considered opinion on whether proposed community participation and distribution of tree sampling is also a medium of implementation of the project as well.
>
> I would kindly request your valuable opinion in this regard at the earliest so that necessary action in this regard may be taken."

20.3 The matter was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for obtaining their factual comments thereon. The Ministry vide their communication dated 31 May, 2001 stated as under:-

> "The undersigned is directed to refer to Lok Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. 9/30/MPLADSC/2001 dated 18.5.2001 on the above subject and to say that the Guidelines permit special forestry, farm forestry, horticulture, pasture, park and gardens in Government and community lands whereas the hon'ble Minister has proposed to distribute one tree sampling each to householders and the general public, who will plant and grow tree samplings wherever desired by them. The proposal to distribute tree samplings free of cost to householders and general public on individual basis, therefore, does not fit into the Guidelines on MPLADS."

<u>Recommendation</u>

20.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Minister of State for Mines and are of the view that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit special forestry, farm forestry, horticulture, pasture, park and gardens in Government and community lands, whereas the hon'ble Minister has proposed to distribute one tree sampling

each to householders and the general public, who would plant and grow tree samplings wherever desired by them. As the proposal to distribute tree sampling free of cost to householders and general public on individual basis, does not hold water as per the Guidelines on MPLADS, therefore, the Committee do not approve it.

XXI

Repair of irrigation canal under MPLADS

21.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 21 May, 2001, enclosing therewith a copy of letter from the Collector, Hingoli, Maharashtra addressed to the Ministry regarding repair of irrigation canal under MPLADS for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

21.2 In his letter dated 29 March, 2001, Collector Hingoli stated as follows:-

"In this connection, the following points are clarified on the basis of the report received from the concerned Executive Engineer.

1) Whether the proposed construction is for desilting of the existing canal or fresh construction:-

The proposed construction work do not relate to desilting of existing canal. In this regard, it is stated that the disnet work under Purna Irrigation project was completed 35 years long back which passes through black – cotton soil which damaged and silted up every year in rainy season and requires frequent repairs while letting out water for kharip, rabi and hot weather seasons. The same repair works could not be undertaken every year due to paucity of meager maintenance grants and as such the agency cannot provide sufficient water to the farmers through the distributory and minors. Such heavily disnet works requires desilting works, raising of banks and in some portion lengths selected lining and maintenance of approach roads. These works are as good as new works.

2) Type of construction:-

The repair work of canal, distributories, minors and sub minors which are heavily silted are to be done. This provides construction and raising of embankment, desilting works, selected lining works and approach roads (murum roads). These works may please be treated as new works.

3) Likely beneficiaries:-

If the above works are executed 30,000 farmers will be benefitted by providing water to 30,000 hectares.

4) After construction who will be responsible for maintenance of the canal:-

The Executive Engineer, Purna Irrigation division, Basmatnagar District, Hingoli will be responsible for maintenance of the canal.

Purna project includes one division office, five sub division offices and 17 section offices for irrigation management, maintenace and repairs of dam and canal system. Their jurisdiction are fixed and as such the agency has prepared

estimates separately in 8 parts as the talukas and the districts changes to sections and sub divisions. This may please be taken into account while allowing this office to sanction these works.

I request you to kindly guide this office in the matter immediately."

21.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation vide their communication dated 21 May, 2001 stated as follows:-

"Please find enclosed herewith copies of the letters received from the Collector, Hingoli, Maharashtra regarding the proposal of Shri Shivajirao Mane, hon'ble MP, Lok Sabha for repair of the Purna irrigation canal at an estimated cost of Rs. 40 lakhs to be taken up under MPLADS, which is stated to have been completed 35 years back and requires frequent repairs. The letter dated 29 March, 2001 received from the District Collector, Hingoli, indicates the nature of work involved, likely beneficiaries and maintenance provisions.

It appears that this is essentially a desilting work of irrigation canal which was constructed 35 years back and the proposed expenditure is around Rs. 40 lakhs. It is felt that such routine repairs should be taken up as a normal departmental work by the Irrigation Department. Since it is not clear whether such desilting/repair work can be taken up with MPLADS fund, it is requested that the proposal may be placed before the Lok Sabha/Rajya Sabha Committee on MPLADS, for consideration."

21.4 However, it appears from the letter dated 29 March, 2001 written by the Collector, Hingoli to the Deputy Adviser (MPLADS) in the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that the aforesaid work relates to repair of the Purna irrigation canal. In this connection, it may be mentioned that Item No.3 of Appendix-2 of the List of works not permissible under MPLADS envisages as follows:-

"Repair and maintenance works of any type other than special repairs for restoration/upgradation of any durable asset."

Recommendation

21.5 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding repair of irrigation canal under MPLADS in District Hingoli in Maharashtra and disapprove it, as Item No. 3 of Appendix-2 containing the List of works not permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS, does not allow repair and maintenance works of any type other than special repairs for restoration/upgradation of any durable asset.

XXII

Representation regarding inclusion of purchase of Aqua-Guard Coolers and Drinking Water Tankers under MPLADS

22.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 14 May, 2001 to Lok Sabha Secretariat enclosing therewith a copy of letter dated 20 April, 2001, alongwith enclosures from the Collector, South Goa District, Margao regarding inclusion of purchase of Aqua Guard Coolers and Drinking Water Tankers under MPLADS, for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

22.2 In his letter dated 20 April, 2001 addressed to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, the Collector, South Goa District, Margao stated as follows:-

> "Shri Eduardo Faleiro, hon'ble MP (Rajya Sabha) has recommended proposals viz. (1) Procurement of "Drinking Water Tanker Truck for Don Bosco Farmers Rehabilitation Society, Quepem and (2) Providing Aqua-Guard Coolers to all Schools of Margao, Salcete, to be taken up under MPLADS.
>
> As per the illustrative list of works that can be taken up under MPLADS, construction of tube-wells and water tanks for providing water to the people in villages, towns or cities or execution of other works which may help in this respect is allowed. The above proposals do not fall within the purview of existing Guidelines.
>
> Shri Eduardo Faleiro, the hon'ble M.P. (Rajya Sabha), desires that the matters viz. (1) and (2) above, may be taken up with the Committee of Members of Rajya Sabha, for favourable consideration and inclusion of the same in the Guidelines under MPLADS. Accordingly, proposals are being submitted for your necessary action and advice."

22.3 The Ministry in their communication dated 14 May, 2001, stated as follows:-

> "The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith a copy of the letter dated 20.4.2001 along with its enclosure received from the Collector, South Goa District, Margao wherein it has been mentioned that Shri Eduardo Faleiro, hon'ble MP (RS) has requested for the inclusion of (1) procurement of Drinking Water Tankers/Trucks; and (2) purchase of Aqua-Guard Water Coolers under MPLADS.
>
> There is specific restriction on purchase of inventory items like Aqua-Guard Water Coolers in the existing Guidelines on MPLADS. Due to this prohibition, procurement of water coolers is not permissible under MPLADS. Therefore, the request of the hon'ble MP (RS) may kindly be placed before the Committee on MPLADS for consideration.
>
> In so far as the procurement of Drinking Water Tankers/Trucks is concerned, the matter has already been recommended by the Lok Sabha Committee in its First and Fifth Report on receipt of similar request from two

other MPs. However, the Rajya Sabha Committee in its Ninth meeting held on 30 June, 2000 had rejected the proposal, but on the basis of Lok Sabha Committee's recommendations, the matter has again been re-referred to the Rajya Sabha Committee for reconsideration vide this Ministry's letter dated 1 May, 2001."

Recommendation

22.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding inclusion of purchase of Aqua-Guard Coolers and Drinking Water Tankers under MPLADS. The Committee reject the proposal of inclusion of the item of Aqua-Guard Cooler under MPLADS as it is an inventory item and purchase of it is specifically prohibited under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

In so far as the procurement of Drinking Water Tankers/Trucks is concerned, the Committee observe that they have already recommended in their First and Fifth Report for purchase of these items under MPLADS on the request of other two hon'ble Members of Parliament. The Committee again reiterate their recommendation and are of the view that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation might be requested to get the approval of inclusion of the items in the Guidelines on MPLADS by the Committee on MPLADS of Rajya Sabha.

XXIII

Suggestion regarding purchase of garbage collection vehicle under MPLADS

23.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 25th June/2nd July, 2001 enclosing therewith a copy of letter dated 16th May, 2001 from Shri Ramakant S. Angle, MP (LS) addressed to Shri Arun Shourie, Minister of State for Planning, Statistics and Programme Implementation and Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances regarding purchase of garbage collection vehicle under MPLADS for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

23.2 In his letter dated 16th May, 2001, the hon'ble Member stated as follows:-

> "Permit me to place before you a genuine problem faced by my tiny State of Goa and appeal to you to amend the Guidelines for MPLAD Scheme so that my State and other can benefit from the same.
>
> As you are aware, Goa is known the world over as a tourist destination. With hordes of tourists coming to Goa – in fact the floating population of the State, is more than the residents of Goa -- there is a tremendous strain on infrastructural facilities.
>
> The Government of Goa has been fighting a tough battle in meeting people's expectations. However, due to paucity of funds, some works cannot be taken up.
>
> One of the main area of concern for residents and tourists alike is the accumulation of garbage at various places in the State. No tourist would like to see garbage collected at places as he or she goes sight seeing and similarly the local residents fear spread of diseases.
>
> The local government cannot provide garbage collection vehicles to municipal areas leave alone panchayats. Given the fact that most of the tourist spots in the State are in panchayat areas, garbage collection in these places is adversely affected.
>
> I would request you to kindly amend the Guidelines for MPLAD Scheme so that MPs be permitted to purchase garbage collection vehicles for panchayats or municipal areas.
>
> Permit me to point out that the MPLAD Guidelines already permit for purchase of night soil tankers, the same can be extended to permit purchase of garbage collection vehicles.
>
> In fact, the cost of these vehicles would be low thereby enabling the MPLAD Scheme to be utilized over a wider area thus making not only the scheme, but the Government also popular.

I earnestly request you to give this proposal a very serious consideration."

23.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 25th June/2nd July, 2001 stated as under:-

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a copy of the letter dated 16.5.2001 addressed to MOS (S&PI) by Shri Ramakant S. Angle on the above subject. He has proposed that the Guidelines may be amended to allow purchase of garbage collection vehicles for panchayats and municipal corporations.

The Guidelines on MPLADS do not permit any type of vehicle except ambulance for Government hospitals and certain NGOs. Earlier, on the request of Shri F.C. Sardinha, former MP from the State of Goa, the Guidelines on MPLADS were amended on 26.5.2000 to allow purchase of night soil disposal system for local bodies, for maintaining cleanliness, etc. The proposal of the hon'ble MP may kindly be placed before the Committee on MPLADS. If the proposal is considered favourably, it may be subject to the condition that such vehicles may be provided only to Government/Local bodies such as municipal corporations, and that all maintenance and operational costs like cost of POL, salaries/wages of drivers, wear and tear costs, costs towards periodical repairs and servicing, etc. will be borne by the concerned Government/local body."

Recommendation

23.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding purchase of garbage collection vehicle under MPLADS. The Committee observe that the Guidelines on MPLADS do not permit purchase of any type of vehicle except ambulance for Government hospitals and certain NGOs. Therefore, the Committee do not approve the proposal of hon'ble Member, as it is also an inventory item and purchase of which is prohibited under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

XXIV

Proposal for removing the cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work under MPLADS

24.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 27 July, 2001 to Lok Sabha Secretariat suggesting therein that the cost ceiling of Rs.25 lakhs per work under MPLADS be removed, for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

24.2 In their communication, the Ministry stated as follows:-

> "The undersigned is directed to say that in the meeting held on 28 June, 2001 at Mumbai under the Chairmanship of MOS (S&PI) to review the implementation of MPLADS in the State of Maharashtra, hon'ble MPs of Maharashtra made a suggestion for removing the cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work under MPLADS.
>
> In this connection, it may be stated that the Guidelines on MPLADS initially issued by Ministry of Rural Development during February, 1994 stipulated that the scheme is for taking up developmental small works of capital nature based on locally felt needs and the cost of each individual work should not exceed Rs. 10 lakhs. The above limit of Rs.10 lakhs per work was, however, raised to Rs. 25 lakhs w.e.f. 26 May, 2000. The revised para 4.1 reads as follows:-
>
> > "Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs.25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs.25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs.25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work (For example, a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs.25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)".
>
> The above provisions already permits exceeding the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs depending on the nature of the work. Proposals of hon'ble MPs for works having costs higher than Rs. 20 lakhs are presently referred to the two Committees on MPLADS for their recommendations, based on merit of each case.
>
> MPs have been suggesting for total removal of this cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work. As mentioned at para one above in the Mumbai meeting also MPs suggested for doing away with the existing ceiling.
>
> The Proposal at above para may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS for their consideration."

Recommendation

24.3 The Committee note the proposal of the Ministry of Statistics and

Programme Implementation regarding the suggestions received from many hon'ble Members for removing the cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work under MPLADS. The Committee, however, are not in favour of removing the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work under MPLADS and are of the considered view that each such proposal should be examined on case to case basis by the Committee. The Committee desire that every proposal for more than Rs.25 lakhs would be decided by them on merits as per the Guidelines on MPLADS.

XXV

Contribution for construction and procurement of equipment for a voluntary blood bank project in Delhi from MPLADS funds

25.1 Shri Arun Shourie, Minister of State for Planning, Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 12 May, 2001 to hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS regarding contribution for construction and procurement of equipment for a voluntary blood bank project in Delhi from MPLADS funds for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

25.2 The hon'ble Minister, in his letter stated as follows:-

"As you know, every year Delhi falls short of 1,50,000 units of blood. Worse still, the unchecked buying and selling of contaminated blood continues to endanger the lives of thousands of unsuspecting patients. Delhi needs clean, fresh blood. And this is best ensured by a world-class voluntary blood bank. Indeed, considering the need for safe blood, in the context of threat of HIV/AIDS, Hepatitis B & C and other blood related diseases, the importance of a blood bank run by voluntary donations cannot be over emphasised.

The Supreme Court itself had taken note of the grave hazards that arise from our sub-standard blood banks, and prescribed an elaborate scheme for improving them.

The Rotary Clubs in Delhi are setting up a voluntary Blood Bank under the auspices of a registered society – Rotary District 3010 Social Welfare Society to ensure availability of safe blood to people in life threatening situations. This Rs. 5 crore, 16,000 sq.ft. blood banking facility is at an advanced stage of construction in Tughlakabad Institutional Area. Land for it has been allotted by the Delhi Government.

Dr. A.R. Kidwai, Shri Fali S. Nariman and Dr. Karan Singh, MPs (Rajya Sabha) have conveyed their consent to contribute Rs. 20 lakh each, and Shri Sahib Singh Verma, MP (LS) also has agreed to assign Rs. 21 lakhs for this project. The contributions will be used for procurement of essential equipment.

As the building is nearing completion, the expenditure out of MPLAD funds for this project will bear immediate results.

You will recall that the Guidelines were recently amended so as to enable Members of Parliament to undertake works up to around Rs. 25 lakhs. While the total cost of this project is around Rs. 5 crore, the contribution that each of the four hon'ble Members has agreed to assign is less than the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs.

Because of the importance of the project; because of the devotion, expertise and integrity of those who are implementing the project; and because of the express desire of the Members of Parliament to support this initiative, we in the Ministry strongly recommended the proposal, and do hope that Committees of the Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha will be kind enough to approve their contribution.

As the contributions are needed urgently, all of us in the Ministry would be grateful if the Committees could give their approval at an early date."

25.3 The Committee on MPLADS in their Third Report (Para 2.7) recommended as follows:-

"2.7 The Committee note the proposal relating to the suggestions to amend Guidelines on MPLADS for inclusion of registered societies and trusts and construction of Blood Bank Projects in the Illustrative List of works that can be taken up under MPLADS. The Committee also note the position stated by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation regarding inclusion of works belonging to registered societies and trusts and construction of Blood Bank Projects in the Illustrative List of works that can be taken up under MPLADS. The Committee after due deliberation recommend the inclusion of works belonging to registered societies and trusts engaged in social service/welfare activities for people below the poverty line (BPL), small and marginal farmers and other small artisans and also registered societies engaged in construction of Blood Bank Projects subject to the following conditions enumerated below apart from other conditions as may be specified by Government from time to time in the light of experience :-

i) The beneficiary organization shall be well-established and reputed one. Whether such organization is reputed or not should be decided by the District Head concerned in consultation with the hon'ble Member on the basis of relevant factors like performance in the field of social service/welfare activities, overall reputation, non-profit operation, transparency of performance and its sound financial position.

ii) The funds from MPLADS will be used for creation of durable assets which would always be available for public use at large.

iii) The ownership of such assets would vest in Government. The sale/transfer/disposal of these assets will not be undertaken without the prior approval of the Government. (Not applicable in the case of Blood Bank Projects).

iv) The maintenance and upkeep of assets so created will have to be ensured by the beneficiary organization in advance and the assets so created will be subject to periodical audit/inspection by the Government.

v) The beneficiary organisation will submit to Government annual report and its audited accounts on regular basis.

vi) The beneficiary organisation must enter into a formal agreement in advance with the Government to comply with the above conditions before the funds from MPLADS are released to them."

25.4 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their action taken note on the above recommendation stated as follows:-

> "The Guidelines on MPLADS have been amended to include Registered Societies/Trusts under MPLADS."

25.5 Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS envisages as follows:-

> "4.1 Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amountshigher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example, a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)".

25.6 In this regard, Shri Vijay Goel, MP (LS) in his letter dated 6 August, 2001 addressed to hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS stated as follows:-

> "I am writing this letter regarding a voluntary Blood Bank being set up by nearly 80 Rotary Clubs in the city of Delhi and adjoining areas of UP and Haryana to serve a population of nearly 15 million people. This is totally a charitable humanitarian project which has been taken up by the service oriented Rotary Clubs to save precious human life in the context of threat of HIV/AIDS, Hepatitis B & C and other blood related diseases.
>
> I understand that on a letter addressed to you earlier by Dr. Sahib Singh Verma, MP, the Committee on MPLADS had decided to include, inter-alia, work taken up by Registered Societies including Rotary and Lion Clubs engaged in the construction of Blood Bank Projects subject to certain conditions laid down therein for funding under MPLADS. Besides, Dr. Sahib Singh Verma, all the three Members of Rajya Sabha from Delhi and a nominated Member, Shri F.S. Nariman have committed Rs. 20 lakhs each from their MPLADS fund for this Rs. 5 crore Blood Bank project. The Blood Bank building falls in the constituency of Dr. Sahib Singh Verma. This Blood Bank is intended to serve every needy person in Delhi irrespective of where he lives. The mission statement of the Blood Bank is that no one shall die in Delhi for want of blood. For a project like this, constituency – specific allocation of funds is an artificial restriction. It is even more so in Metropolitan Cities, which elect 7 to 10 Members to Lok Sabha. A hospital, a blood bank or an educational institution in a Metropolitan City or similar projects which benefit every one in a Metropolitan City or similar projects which benefit every one in the city should be eligible to receive funds from all Members of Lok Sabha representing various constituencies in Metropolitan towns.

I would, therefore, request you to take up this matter in the Committee to remove this restriction on allocation of funds to a project in another constituency in the Metropolitan Cities. Apart from this larger issue, I would request you and through you the Committee to allow me to allocate Rs. 10 lakhs for purchase of Blood Bank equipment from my MPLADS for the Rotary Blood Bank in Delhi even though it falls in another Lok Sabha Constituency which is scheduled for inauguration this year in October. The Blood Bank is being set up by the Rotary District 3010 Welfare Society, which is a registered Society. Since time is of the essence, I shall be grateful for an early action at your end."

25.7 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 22 August, 2001 stated as under:-

"The undersigned is directed to refer to the Lok Sabha Secretariat OM No. 9/63/MPLADS/2001 dated 10 August, 2001 on the above subject and to say that the recommendations contained in para 2.7 of the Third Report relates to the amendment of the Guidelines on MPLADS, so as to include works relating to Registered Societies/Trusts for construction of buildings whereas the proposal sent by hon'ble MOS (S&PI) on 12 May, 2001 relates to procurement of essential equipments for the blood bank being set up Rotary Club for which some MPs have consented to allocate funds. Since the present proposal for procurement of `essential equipment' is different from the recommendations made by the Lok Sabha Committee earlier, the matter needs to be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for its recommendation, for relaxation on the following points:-

(i) Procurement of equipment, as the same is classified an inventory items, for which there is specific restriction.

(ii) The cost of the equipment to be procured is much higher than Rs. 25 lakhs and therefore relaxation is required on this account.

In view of the above, it is requested that the case may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha."

25.8 The Committee may consider whether the relaxation for purchase of procurement of equipments which are a classified inventory item and the cost of which is much higher than Rs. 25 lakhs might be given to the hon'ble Members of Parliament, for the aforesaid blood bank project. The Committee may also consider whether Shri Vijay Goel, MP (LS) may be allowed to contribute for this project from his quota of MPLADS fund which is outside his Parliamentary constituency.

Recommendation

25.9 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Members regarding contribution for construction and procurement of equipment for a voluntary blood bank project in Delhi from MPLADS funds. The Committee observe that there is already provision in amended para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS for making contribution of Rs. 25 lakhs for works under MPLADS and there is also restriction for purchase of inventory or stock of any type as per item No.6 of Appendix-2 of the Guidelines on MPLADS. However, keeping in view the dire need to have blood bank in Delhi, which would go a long way to cater to the needs of the needy, the

Committee recommend to allow the request for purchase of equipment for the Blood Bank as a special case on humanitarian grounds. They further desire that the equipment should be purchased from the reputed agencies/hospitals. The Committee also recommend to waive the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs in those cases where an individual MP wants to invest more than this amount in his respective constituency. Further, the Committee recommend that no contribution could be made from the quota of MPLADS funds outside the Parliamentary constituency of a Member of Parliament except in the case of natural calamity of rare severity.

New Delhi
30 August, 2001
Bhadrapada 8, 1923(S)

Dr. BOLLA BULLI RAMAIAH
Chairman,
Committee on Members of Parliament
Local Area Development Scheme

APPENDIX-I

MINUTES OF SEVENTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LOK SABHA)

The Committee sat on Tuesday, the 7th August, 2001 from 1600 to 1710 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Bolla Bulli Ramaiah - Chairman

MEMBERS PRESENT

2. Dr. Baliram
3. Shri G.M. Banatwalla
4. Shri Surendra Singh Barwala
5. Shri Bikram Keshari Deo
6. Shri Sis Ram Ola
7. Shri S.B.P.B.K. Satyanarayana Rao
8. Shri Tara Chand Sahu
9. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
10. Shri Chinmayanand Swami

SPECIAL INVITEE

Shri P.S. Gadhavi

SECRETARIAT

1. Dr.(Smt.) Paramjit Kaur Sandhu - Joint Secretary
2. Shri R.N. Kalra - Director
3. Shri S.C.Kaliraman - Assistant Director

2. At the outset, the Committee took up for consideration memoranda Nos. 13 to 29 relating to amendment in the Guidelines on MPLADS. The decisions/recommendations are given memorandum-wise seriatim:-

(i) Memorandum No. 13 regarding, "**Permission to purchase mobile buses/vans under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Member for taking permission to purchase mobile buses/vans under MPLADS and disapproved it as it was against the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee were of the opinion thatthe purchase of mobile buses/vans under MPLADS might create problem of maintenance and recurring expenditure.

(ii) Memorandum No. 14 regarding, "**Construction of a Memorial Community Hall under MPLADS."**

The Committee perused the proposal of hon'ble Member (Rajya Sabha) and decided to disapprove it as there was a specific restriction on construction of memorial/memorial buildings as per Item No.5 of Appendix 2 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

(iii) Memorandum No. 15 regarding, "**Amendment in the Guidelines to provide financial assistance out of MPLADS funds for Internet Dhabas in all block/mandal headquarters in the country."**

The Committee decided to defer the proposal for consideration in their next meeting.

(iv) Memorandum No. 16 regarding, "**Provision for administrative expenses under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the matter and decided to allow to utilise half per cent amount as administrative expenses by the district authorities out of the existing allocation of each MP per year under MPLADS.

(v) Memorandum No. 17 regarding, "**Purchase of Hearse Van under MPLADS funds."**

The Committee discussed the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha and decided to reject it as the purchase of Hearse Van was not covered by the provisions of the Guidelines on MPLADS. The existing Guidelines on MPLADS permit procurement of ambulances for the Government hospitals and reputed service organisations like Rama Krishna Mission, Red Cross society etc. but purchase of Hearse Van was not allowed under the MPLADS Guidelines.

(vi) Memorandum No. 18 regarding, "**Relaxation of upper limit of Rs.25 lakhs for individual works recommended under MPLADS – construction of cultural centres under MPLADS."**

The Committee discussed the proposal of hon'ble Member and approved it stating that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of cultural centres vide Item No.6 of Appendix I of the Guidelines. Accordingly, the Committee agreed to allow relaxation of upper limit of Rs. 25 lakhs for construction of cultural centres in Punjab as proposed by hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha.

(vii) Memorandum No. 19 regarding, "**Review of functioning of MPLAD Scheme."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha and were of the opinion that as there are both the Committees of Lok Sabha

and Rajya Sabha on the MPLAD Scheme, therefore, there appeared no need to constitute a Joint Parliamentary Committee to look into the functioning of the Scheme particularly in the light of the observations made by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

(viii) Memorandum No. 20 regarding, "**Use of MPLADS funds for purchase of a bus for Government Girls Degree College in Udhampur Parliamentary constituency in Jammu and Kashmir."**

The Committee perused the proposal of hon'ble Minister of State for Civil Aviation and decided not to permit purchase of bus for Government Girls Degree College in Udhampur Parliamentary constituency in Jammu and Kashmir as the Guidelines on MPLADS do not permit purchase of any type of vehicle except ambulances for Government hospitals and reputed service organisations with certain conditions. The Committee were of the opinion that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit works which are developmental in nature and lead to creation of durable assets. There was also specific restriction on incurring revenue expenditure and purchase of inventory item. Therefore, the Committee rejected the proposal for purchase of a bus for school/college as it did not fit into the framework of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

(ix) Memorandum No. 21 regarding, "**Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India."**

The Committee perused the comments of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation made by them on the observations made in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31 March, 2000, Union Government (civil), Performance Appraisal No. 3A of 2001 regarding execution of works and utilisation of funds under MPLADS. The Committee decided that the aforesaid C&AG Report would be discussed by them thoroughly in a separate meeting.

(x) Memorandum No. 22 regarding, "**Construction of Foot Over Bridge across the River Salandi in Orissa under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Minister of Water Resources regarding construction of foot over bridge across the river Salandi in Orissa under MPLADS and decided to permit him to contribute Rs. 56.00 lakhs for this project from his quota of MPLADS funds as it was within the provisions of Para 4.1 of the existing Guidelines on MPLADS, which envisages that the cost of individual work should not exceed Rs. 25 lakhs which, however, can be exceeded marginally in relevant cases based on need.

(xi) Memorandum No. 23 regarding, "**Purchase of Mobile Dental Van from MPLADS funds."**

The Committee discussed the proposal of hon'ble Member, Rajya Sabha for

taking permission for purchase of a Mobile Dental Van from MPLADS funds. The Committee while keeping in view the instructions dated 15.10.1999 issued by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to all DCs/DMs which stipulate that mobile dispensaries cannot be provided to the NGOs in the name of the ambulance or otherwise, decided to reject the proposal of hon'ble Member for purchase of Mobile Dental Van under MPLADS.

(xii) Memorandum No. 24 regarding, "**Permission to construct individual houses in the earthquake affected Dholaveera village in Gujarat under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology and decided to consider it later on after having visited the earthquake affected areas of Gujarat and finalisation of the agency for construction and rehabilitation works in those areas.

(xiii) Memorandum No. 25 regarding, "**Funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds."**

The Committee discussed the proposal and decided to reject it as the extant Guidelines on MPLADS prohibited any work relating to office building as well as allocation of funds by the Members of Parliament outside their constituency.

(xiv) Memorandum No. 26 regarding, "**Appointing of executive agency by Member of Parliament for works recommended by him under MPLADS."**

The Committee perused the proposal of hon'ble Member and reiterated its earlier recommendation given in Para 11.2 in their Second Report and also decided that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation might be requested to expedite the recommendation by the Committee on MPLADS (Rajya Sabha) on this aspect.

(xv) Memorandum No. 27 regarding, "**Purchase of completed/ incompleted buildings under MPLADS."**

The Committee discussed the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding seeking permission to purchase of completed/incompleted buildings under MPLADS. The Committee rejected the proposal as there was no provision in the Guidelines on MPLADS for purchase of ready built or incomplete buildings.

(xvi) Memorandum No. 28 regarding, "**Seeking permission to contribute Rs.1.00 crore from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families in Churachandpur District, in Manipur."**

The Committee perused the proposal of hon'ble Member and agreed with the comments of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation thereon that the case was not covered under Para 1.3 of the amended Guidelines on MPLADS which

enables MPs to spend MPLADS funds outside their constituency in cases of natural calamity of rare severity. The Committee were of the opinion that the hon'ble Member can recommend works in areas falling under his constituency only and these works should be recommended as per the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee rejected the proposal of hon'ble Member on the grounds that it amounts to use the MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families affected by ethnic clashes in Manipur and it was against the Guidelines on MPLADS.

(xvii) Memorandum No. 29 regarding, "**Relaxation of the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs for projects under MPLADS by Dr. Y. Lakshmi Prasad, MP (RS).**"

The Committee perused the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha and approved it as it was well within the Guidelines on MPLADS and has also been already approved by the Committee on MPLADS (Rajya Sabha).

XX XX XX

The Committee then adjourned

APPENDIX-II

MINUTES OF EIGHTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LOK SABHA)

The Committee sat on Tuesday, the 28th August, 2001 from 1000 to 1040 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Bolla Bulli Ramaiah - Chairman

MEMBERS PRESENT

2. Shri Adhi Sankar
3. Shri G.M. Banatwalla
4. Shri Bikram Keshari Deo
5. Shri Raghuvir Singh Kaushal
6. Shri Chandrakant Khaire
7. Prof. R.R. Pramanik
8. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
9. Shri Balbir Singh
10. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
11. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

SECRETARIAT

1.	Dr.(Smt.) Paramjit Kaur Sandhu	-	Joint Secretary
2.	Shri R.N. Kalra	-	Director
3.	Shri S.C.Kaliraman	-	Assistant Director

2. At the outset, the Committee took up for consideration memoranda Nos. 30 to 41 relating to amendment in the Guidelines on MPLADS. The decisions/recommendations are given memorandum-wise seriatim:-

(i) Memorandum No. 30 regarding, "**Permission to construct individual houses in the earthquake affected Dholaveera village in Gujarat under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology for taking permission to construct individual houses in the earthquake affected Dholaveera village in Gujarat under MPLADS. The Committee noted that the Guidelines on MPLADS lay down specific restriction on creation of assets for individual benefits and the construction of individual houses was not permitted under the present Guidelines. The Committee also noted that the Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha have already approved the aforesaid proposal of hon'ble Minister in their meeting held on 23 July, 2001. The Committee keeping in

view the urgency of the need of shelters for the homeless people in earthquake affected village Dholaveera in Gujarat approved the proposal of hon'ble Minister for construction of 550 houses in that village as a special case. The Committee decided that it would be a one time relaxation under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

(ii) Memorandum No. 31 regarding, "**Amendment in formats placed at Appendix-3 and Appendix-4 of the Guidelines on MPLADS."**

The Committee perused the proposal of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation regarding amendment in formats placed at Appendix-3 and Appendix-4 of the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee, while agreeing with the views of the Ministry that there was necessity to change the formats of the Guidelines on MPLADS particularly at Appendix-3 and Appendix-4, decided to approve the amendments in these appendices as proposed by the Ministry. The Committee also decided that a column should be incorporated in the format placed at Appendix-3 of the Guidelines showing information regarding the balance amount left under the MPLADS funds after having received suggestions/recommendations by the Member of Parliament regarding implementation of works under MPLADS. The Committee also desired that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should be requested to issue necessary instructions to all the DMs, directing them to send a copy of the sanction letter pertaining to the sanction of any project/scheme to the concerned MP also.

(iii) Memorandum No. 32 regarding, "**Purchase of digitization equipment under MPLADS for Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samastha (SGS) run by a registered body."**

The Committee discussed the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding purchase of digitization equipment under MPLADS for Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samastha (SGS) run by a registered body. The Committee observed that the proposal of SGS for purchase of digitization equipment would include modern computer, scanners, CD writers, CD servers, Laser printers, air-conditioners, fax machine, micro film, micro fish reader-cum-printer, the high-end Xerox machine and legal software. These items in question are items of inventory, purchase of which is specifically prohibited under the existing Guidelines on MPLADS. The purchase of computers is allowed under MPLADS for Government and Government aided schools/educational institutions only for educational and training purposes for the benefit of student community. In view of this, the Committee did not approve the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha.

(iv) Memorandum No. 33 regarding, "**Change of Nodal District Collector in respect of nominated MPs of Rajya Sabha."**

The Committee considered the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding his request of change of Nodal District i.e., (i) allowing release of funds without receipt of required report and (ii) allowing a nominated MP to have more than one Nodal District at a given point of time. The Committee noted that the hon'ble Member had already changed his Nodal District twice and desired to change it for the third time. The Committee approved the proposal subject to the condition that this is the last change of Distirct Nodal Officer and no further change would be considered by the Committee**.**

(v) Memorandum No. 34 regarding, "**Inclusion of purchase of Rotating Sprinklers under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Member and noted that the item rotating sprinklers is classifiable as an item of inventory, purchase of which is specifically prohibited under the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee were of the opinion that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of irrigation embankments or lift irrigation or water table recharging facilities, tubewells and water tanks. Apparently, the rotating sprinklers would be distributed to farmers on individual basis and the Guidelines on MPLADS specifically prohibits assets for individual benefit. Thus, the purchase of rotating sprinklers is not covered by these provisions. The Committee, therefore, is not in a position to approve the aforesaid proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha.

(vi) Memorandum No. 35 regarding, "**Utilisation of MPLADS funds for special forestry projects."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Minister of State for Mines and were of the view that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit special forestry, farm forestry, horticulture, pasture, park and gardens in Government and community lands, whereas the hon'ble Minister has proposed to distribute one tree sampling each to householders and the general public, who would plant and grow tree samplings wherever desired by them. As the proposal to distribute tree sampling free of cost to householders and general public on individual basis, does not hold water as per the Guidelines on MPLADS, therefore, the Committee disapproved it.

(vii) Memorandum No. 36 regarding, "**Repair of irrigation canal under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding repair of irrigation canal under MPLADS in District Hingoli in Maharashtra and decided to disapprove it as Item No. 3 of Appendix-2 containing the List of works not permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS, does not allow repair and maintenance works of any type other than special repairs for restoration/upgradation of any durable asset.

(viii) Memorandum No. 37 regarding, "**Inclusion of purchase of Aqua-Guard Coolers and Drinking Water Tankers under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding inclusion of purchase of Aqua-Guard Coolers and Drinking Water Tankers under MPLADS. The Committee rejected the proposal of inclusion of the item of Aqua-Guard Cooler under MPLADS as it is an inventory item and purchase of it is specifically prohibited under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

In so far as the procurement of Drinking Water Tankers/Trucks is concerned, the Committee noted that they have already recommended in their First and Fifth Report for purchase of these items under MPLADS on the request of other two hon'ble Members of Parliament. The Committee again reiterated their recommendation and were of the view that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation might be requested to get the approval of inclusion of the items in the Guidelines on MPLADS by the Committee on MPLADS of Rajya Sabha.

(ix) Memorandum No. 38 regarding, "**Purchase of garbage collection vehicle under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding purchase of garbage collection vehicle under MPLADS. The Committee noted that the Guidelines on MPLADS do not permit purchase of any type of vehicle except ambulance for Government hospitals and certain NGOs. Therefore, the Committee did not approve the proposal of hon'ble Member, as it is also an inventory item and purchase of which is prohibited under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

(x) Memorandum No. 39 regarding, "**Proposal for removing the cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work under MPLADS."**

The Committee discussed the proposal of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation regarding the suggestions received from many hon'ble Members for removing the cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work under MPLADS. The Committee, however, were not in favour of removing the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work under MPLADS and were of the considered view that each such proposal should be examined on case to case basis by the Committee. The Committee decided that every proposal for more than Rs.25 lakhs would be decided by them on merits as per the Guidelines on MPLADS.

(xi) Memorandum No. 40 regarding, "**Amendment in the Guidelines to provide financial assistance out of MPLADS funds for Internet Dhabas in all block/mandal headquarters in the country."**

The Committee discussed the proposal and after due deliberation decided to drop it, as it was not feasible to provide and maintain Internet Dhabas in all block/mandal headquarters in the country free of cost to the public under MPLADS.

(xii) Memorandum No. 41 regarding, "**Contribution for construction and procurement of equipment for a voluntary blood bank project in Delhi from MPLADS funds."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of hon'ble Members regarding contribution for construction and procurement of equipment for a voluntary blood bank project in Delhi from MPLADS funds. The Committee noted that there is already provision in amended para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS for making contribution of Rs. 25 lakhs for works under MPLADS and there is also restriction for purchase of inventory or stock of any type as per item No.6 of Appendix-2 of the Guidelines on MPLADS. However, keeping in view the dire need to have blood bank in Delhi, which would go a long way to cater to the needs of the needy, the Committee decided to allow the request for purchase of equipment for the Blood Bank as a special case on humanitarian grounds. They further opined that the equipment should be purchased from the reputed agencies/hospitals. They also agreed to waive the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs in those cases where an individual MP wants to invest more than this amount in his respective constituency. Further, the Committee were also of the views that no contribution could be made from the quota of MPLADS funds outside the Parliamentary constituency of a Member of Parliament except in the case of natural calamity of rare severity.

3. The Committee also reviewed its decision taken on 7 August, 2001 regarding the proposal of Shri Holkhomang Haokip, MP (LS) for seeking permission to contribute Rs. 1.00 crore from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families in Churachandpur District in Manipur. The Committee deliberated over the proposal and allowed the hon'ble Member to recommend works in areas falling under his Parliamentary constituency only and these works should be recommended as per the Guidelines on MPLADS.

4. Thereafter, the Committee decided that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should be requested to issue instructions/guidelines to the Planning Secretaries/DMs/DCs of all the States and Union Territories stating therein that the MPLADS amount should be deposited in any Nationalised Banks in consultation with the concerned Member of Parliament. In case, the MP and DM happen to differ, the decision of the MP should prevail and be final.

The Committee then adjourned

APPENDIX-III

OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.5 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member for taking permission to purchase mobile buses/vans under MPLADS and disapprove it as it is against the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee are of the view that the purchase of mobile buses/vans under MPLADS might create problem of maintenance and recurring expenditure.

2.4 The Committee consider the proposal of hon'ble Member (Rajya Sabha) regarding construction of a Memorial Community Hall under MPLADS and do not approve it as there is a specific restriction on construction of memorials or memorial buildings as per Item No.5 of Appendix-2 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

3.5 The Committee note the proposal regarding making provision for administrative expenses under MPLADS. The Committee recommend that necessary amendment might be incorporated in the Guidelines on MPLADS to allow to utilise half per cent amount as administrative expenses by the district authorities out of the existing allocation of each Member of Parliament per year under MPLADS.

4.4 The Committee consider the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding purchase of Hearse Van from MPLADS funds and decide to reject it as the purchase of Hearse Van is not covered by the provisions of the Guidelines on MPLADS. The existing Guidelines on MPLADS permit procurement of ambulances for the Government hospitals and reputed service organisations like Rama Krishna Mission, Red Cross society etc. but purchase of Hearse Van is not allowed under the MPLADS Guidelines.

5.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding seeking relaxation of upper limit of Rs. 25 lakhs for individual works for construction of cultural centres under MPLAD in Punjab. The Committee approve the proposal as the Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of cultural centres vide Item No. 6 of Appendix-I of the Guidelines. Accordingly, the Committee recommend to allow relaxation of upper limit of Rs. 25 lakhs for construction of cultural centres in Punjab as proposed by hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha.

6.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding review of functioning of MPLAD Scheme particularly in the light of observations made by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in their Report No. 3 A(civil), Union Government, for the year ending 31 March, 2000. The Committee are of the views that as there are both the Committees of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on the MPLAD Scheme, therefore, there appear no need to constitute a Joint Parliamentary Committee to look into the functioning of the Scheme, particularly in the light of the observations made in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

7.4 The Committee consider the proposal of hon'ble Minister of State for Civil Aviation regarding use of MPLADS funds for purchase of a bus for Government Girls Degree College in Udhampur Parliamentary constituency in Jammu and Kashmir. The Committee do not allow the purchase of bus for the Government Girls Degree College in Udhampur, as there is no provision in the Guidelines on MPLADS for purchase of any type of vehicle except ambulances for Government hospitals and reputed service organisations with certain conditions. The Committee are of the views that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit works which are developmental in nature and lead to creation of durable assets. There is also specific restriction on incurring revenue expenditure and purchase of inventory item. Therefore, the Committee reject the proposal for purchase of a bus for school/college as it does not fit into the framework of the Guidelines of the Scheme.

8.5 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Minister of Water Resources regarding construction of foot over bridge across the river Salandi in Orissa under MPLADS. The Committee recommend to allow the hon'ble Minister to contribute Rs. 56.00 lakhs for this project from his quota of MPLADS funds as it is within the provisions of Para 4.1 of the existing Guidelines on MPLADS, which envisages that the cost of individual work should not exceed Rs. 25 lakhs which, however, can be exceeded marginally in relevant cases based on need and nature of the work.

9.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member, Rajya Sabha for taking permission for purchase of a Mobile Dental Van from MPLADS funds. The Committee while keeping in view the instructions dated 15.10.1999 issued by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to all District Commissioners/District Magistrates which stipulate that mobile dispensaries cannot be provided to the NGOs in the name of the ambulance or otherwise, reject the proposal of hon'ble Member for purchase of Mobile Dental Van under MPLADS.

10.3 The Committee note the proposal regarding funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds and reject it as the extant Guidelines on MPLADS prohibit any work relating to construction of office building as well as allocation of funds by the Members of Parliament outside their constituency except in the case of natural calamity of rare severity.

11.7 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding appointing of executive agency by Member of Parliament for works recommended by him under MPLADS and reiterate their earlier recommendation given in Para 11.2 in their Second Report. The Committee also recommend that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation expedite the recommendation by the Committee on MPLADS (Rajya Sabha) on this aspect.

12.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding seeking permission to purchase completed/incomplete buildings under MPLADS. The Committee are of the views that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of durable assets on land belonging to Government or even on land belonging to private organisation subject to conditions stipulated in Para 2.6 of the Guidelines. Therefore, the Committee reject the proposal of hon'ble Member as there is no provision in the Guidelines on MPLADS for purchase of ready built or incomplete buildings.

13.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding seeking permission to contribute Rs. 1.00 crore from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families in Churachandpur District, in Manipur. The Committee agree with the comments of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in this regard that the case is not covered under Para 1.3 of the amended Guidelines on MPLADS which enables MPs to spend MPLADS funds outside their constituency in cases of natural calamity of rare severity. The Committee are of the views that the hon'ble Member can recommend works in areas falling under his constituency only and these works should be recommended as per the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee do not approve the proposal of hon'ble Member on the grounds that it amounts to use the MPLADS funds for rehabilitation of the displaced families affected by ethnic clashes in Manipur as it is against the Guidelines on MPLADS.

14.5 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding seeking relaxation of the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs for projects under MPLADS and approve it as it is well within the Guidelines on MPLADS and has also been already approved by the Committee on MPLADS (Rajya Sabha).

15.7 The Committee consider the proposal of hon'ble Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology for taking permission to construct individual houses in the earthquake affected Dholaveera village in Gujarat under MPLADS. The Committee note that the Guidelines on MPLADS lay down specific restriction on creation of assets for individual benefits and the construction of individual houses was not permitted under the present Guidelines. The Committee also note that the Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha have already approved the aforesaid proposal of hon'ble Minister in their meeting held on 23 July, 2001. The Committee keeping in view the urgency of the need of shelters for the homeless people in earthquake affected village Dholaveera in Gujarat approve the proposal of hon'ble Minister for construction of 550 houses in that village as a special case. The Committee recommend that it would be a one time relaxation under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

16.3 The Committee peruse the proposal of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation regarding amendment in formats placed at Appendix-3 and Appendix-4 of the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee, while agreeing with the views of the Ministry that there was necessity to change the formats of the Guidelines on MPLADS particularly at Appendix-3 and Appendix-4, approve the amendments in these appendices as proposed by the Ministry. The Committee also recommend that a column should be incorporated in the format placed at Appendix-3 of the Guidelines showing information regarding the balance amount left under the MPLADS funds after having received suggestions/recommendations by the Member of Parliament regarding implementation of works under MPLADS. The Committee also desire that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should be requested to issue necessary instructions to all the DMs, directing them to send a copy of the sanction letter pertaining to the sanction of any project/scheme to the concerned MP also.

17.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding purchase of digitization equipment under MPLADS for Sundarayya Grandhalaya Samastha (SGS) run by a registered body. The

Committee observe that the proposal of SGS for purchase of digitization equipment would include modern computer, scanners, CD writers, CD servers, Laser printers, air-conditioners, fax machine, micro film, micro fish reader-cum-printer, the high-end Xerox machine and legal software. These items in question are items of inventory, purchase of which is specifically prohibited under the existing Guidelines on MPLADS. The purchase of computers is allowed under MPLADS for Government and Government aided schools/educational institutions only for educational and training purposes for the benefit of student community. In view of this, the Committee do not approve the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha.

18.4 The Committee consider the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding his request of change of Nodal District i.e., (i) allowing release of funds without receipt of required report and (ii) allowing a nominated MP to have more than one Nodal District at a given point of time. The Committee note that the hon'ble Member had already changed his Nodal District twice and desired to change it for the third time. The Committee approve the proposal subject to the condition that this is the last change of District Nodal Officer and no further change would be considered by the Committee.

19.5 The Committee after considering the proposal of hon'ble Member note that the item rotating sprinklers is classifiable as an item of inventory and purchase of which is specifically prohibited under the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee are of the view that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of irrigation embankments or lift irrigation or water table recharging facilities, tubewells and water tanks. Apparently, the rotating sprinklers would be distributed to farmers on individual basis and the Guidelines on MPLADS specifically prohibits assets for individual benefit. Thus, the purchase of rotating sprinklers is not covered by these provisions. The Committee, therefore, do not approve the aforesaid proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha.

20.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Minister of State for Mines and are of the view that the Guidelines on MPLADS permit special forestry, farm forestry, horticulture, pasture, park and gardens in Government and community lands, whereas the hon'ble Minister has proposed to distribute one tree sampling each to householders and the general public, who would plant and grow tree samplings wherever desired by them. As the proposal to distribute tree sampling free of cost to householders and general public on individual basis, does not hold water as per the Guidelines on MPLADS, therefore, the Committee do not approve it.

21.5 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding repair of irrigation canal under MPLADS in District Hingoli in Maharashtra and disapprove it, as Item No. 3 of Appendix-2 containing the List of works not permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS, does not allow repair and maintenance works of any type other than special repairs for restoration/upgradation of any durable asset.

22.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding inclusion of purchase of Aqua-Guard Coolers and Drinking Water Tankers under MPLADS. The Committee reject the proposal of inclusion of the

item of Aqua-Guard Cooler under MPLADS as it is an inventory item and purchase of it is specifically prohibited under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

In so far as the procurement of Drinking Water Tankers/Trucks is concerned, the Committee observe that they have already recommended in their First and Fifth Report for purchase of these items under MPLADS on the request of other two hon'ble Members of Parliament. The Committee again reiterate their recommendation and are of the view that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation might be requested to get the approval of inclusion of the items in the Guidelines on MPLADS by the Committee on MPLADS of Rajya Sabha.

23.4 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Member regarding purchase of garbage collection vehicle under MPLADS. The Committee observe that the Guidelines on MPLADS do not permit purchase of any type of vehicle except ambulance for Government hospitals and certain NGOs. Therefore, the Committee do not approve the proposal of hon'ble Member, as it is also an inventory item and purchase of which is prohibited under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

24.3 The Committee note the proposal of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation regarding the suggestions received from many hon'ble Members for removing the cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work under MPLADS. The Committee, however, are not in favour of removing the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs per work under MPLADS and are of the considered view that each such proposal should be examined on case to case basis by the Committee. The Committee desire that every proposal for more than Rs.25 lakhs would be decided by them on merits as per the Guidelines on MPLADS.

25.9 The Committee note the proposal of hon'ble Members regarding contribution for construction and procurement of equipment for a voluntary blood bank project in Delhi from MPLADS funds. The Committee observe that there is already provision in amended para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS for making contribution of Rs. 25 lakhs for works under MPLADS and there is also restriction for purchase of inventory or stock of any type as per item No.6 of Appendix-2 of the Guidelines on MPLADS. However, keeping in view the dire need to have blood bank in Delhi, which would go a long way to cater to the needs of the needy, the Committee recommend to allow the request for purchase of equipment for the Blood Bank as a special case on humanitarian grounds. They further desire that the equipment should be purchased from the reputed agencies/hospitals. The Committee also recommend to waive the ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs in those cases where an individual MP wants to invest more than this amount in his respective constituency. Further, the Committee recommend that no contribution could be made from the quota of MPLADS funds outside the Parliamentary constituency of a Member of Parliament except in the case of natural calamity of rare severity.